



THE

# AFCON

SENTINEL



Volume II, Number 4

A Quarterly of the Academic Freedom Coalition of Nebraska

December 18, 1998

## AFCON OFFICERS

Mel Krutz  
President

John Bender  
Past President

Kathryn Stofer  
Secretary

Cathi McMurtry  
Treasurer

David Moshman  
Policy Coordinator

Tom Black  
Newsletter Editor

### Purpose:

To promote academic freedom, defined as intellectual freedom in educational and research contexts.

This includes freedoms of belief and expression and access to information and ideas.

## Rationality and Liberty in Secondary Education

by David Moshman

This article, continued from the September issue of the AFCON SENTINEL, is the concluding chapter in David Moshman's forthcoming book entitled *Adolescent Psychological Development: Rationality, Morality, and Identity*, to be published in 1999 by Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. For further information, contact the author at the Department of Educational Psychology, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE 68588-0345. (phone: 402-472-2226; e-mail: dmoshman@unl.edu.)

### Intellectual Freedom in Secondary Education

Even if one accepts the argument that intellectual freedom is essential to the development of rationality and thus to any educational program that aims to promote rationality, one might wonder how this applies with respect to students of various ages. If children and adolescents do not understand the nature and purpose of intellectual freedom, they may be unable to operate effectively in an environment that presents multiple viewpoints and encourages them to think and speak for themselves.

Research indicates, however, that children as young as age 6 show meaningful conceptions of intellectual freedom (Hewlett, 1997, 1998) and that adolescents do not differ substantially from college students in this regard (Dunkle, 1993; Helwig, 1995a; Wainryb, Shaw, & Laupa, under review; Wainryb, Shaw, & Maianu, in press.) Charles Helwig (1995a,) for example, assessed conceptions of freedom of speech and religion in eight males and eight females at each of grades 7, 11, and college. Students were asked to evaluate potential laws restricting these freedoms and to evaluate various applications of these freedoms, including cases where the freedom was exercised in a manner potentially offensive or harmful to others (such as speech involving racial slurs.)

In each case students were asked to justify their responses.

Virtually all students at all three ages showed substantial support for freedoms of speech and religions. Although there were differences in opinion with regard to the more complex dilemmas in which freedom conflicted with other values, these individual differences were found at each of the three ages. Even the seventh graders, moreover, justified their responses in ways that showed clear appreciation of the issue involved. The results, concluded Helwig,

show that sophisticated conceptions of civil liberties emerge by early adolescence and are used to evaluate social events . . . . Abstract conceptions of rights were judged in accordance with moral criteria . . . and justified by diverse and sophisticated rationales differentiated according to type of freedom. These abstract rights were also applied to judgments of social events in context. . . . These aspects of individuals' judgments and reasoning were found to be continuous across the age-span studied (p. 162.)

Other research has generated similar results (Dunkle, 1993; Ruck, Abramovitch, & Keating, 1998; Wainryb et al., under review, in press.) Cecilia Wainryb and her associates (in press,) for example, interviewed 20 males and 20 females at each of grades 1, 4, 7, and college about hypothetical cases in which a parent or teacher (a) holds a dissenting belief, (b) expresses such a belief, or (c) acts on such a belief. The dissenting beliefs were views that every participant disagreed with (e.g., that children learn best by being ridiculed for their mistakes or that girls are not as smart as boys and thus more likely to get into trouble.) Overall, there was greater tolerance for the holding of dissenting beliefs than for the expression of those beliefs and, in turn, more tolerance for the expression of dissenting beliefs than for actions based on those beliefs. These results suggest that, rather than being generally tolerant or generally intolerant, individuals across a wide age range make differentiated judgments about when tolerance is appropriate

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—Mel Krutz

I thought this last message ought to be a review of the year, and then remembered that we just did that—the whole sequence of this year and all **ten years** since 1988 in the 10th Anniversary Manual handed out at our Celebration held as part of the NELAC Conference on October 22. If you don't have a copy, please request one.

It has been a decade to celebrate. You'll see as you read the pages. Probing the memory of any of the board members could bring additions to the pages—personal recollections of those years, interactions, and presentations of AFCON members at other conferences or discussions, aside from those with constituent members—experiences of value. But that's another book.

Look at the names on each page of the decade, the numbers of persons involved, and who continue to participate, the varieties of impressive presentations, speakers, and topics that can only be described in total as remarkable. Thank you to all of you.

In recognition of the extensive amount of activity **this year**, special thanks to the 1998 board:

\* Jeff Lofthus, not only for his work with the survey in process, but also with his willingness to share information and insight at conferences, presenting for AFCON, and his replacing Lori Shriner as membership

chair.

\* Kathy Stofer for starting our year's participation with the NCMA Conference in Lincoln, for her work as secretary, note-card maker, composer of news releases, formatter of brochures, and more.

\* Cathi McMurtry who has tirelessly not only served as treasurer, but who has also collected the important papers, minutes, newsletters, and records of AFCON through the decade, and who has given stability to AFCON by providing a consistent address.

\* John Bender for coming through with good advice and valuable documents like the information on the Student Freedom of Expression Bill cogently put together in a handout, and for his consistent work with challenges facing student journalists and advisors.

\* Tom Black for letting us tap his talents on the computer for many kinds of needs from stationery to certificates, for putting together powerful newsletters, for insisting on deadlines, and for work on constitutional revision, the sales' tables, organizing our participation for the NSEA Conference, and more.

\* Dave Moshman for steering clear and logical focus in all of AFCON's endeavors, guiding policy and vision, and consistently supporting many facets of AFCON's work.

\* Gerry Cox for chairing this year's

celebratory event, and the great extent of her participation in AFCON also in the decade past!

\* Bob Haller whose sense of possibilities for conference topics and speakers has been insightful, who has graciously shared his home for meetings, and gives balance and direction to discussions and decisions, and more.

\* Joseph Stimpfl, new to the board this year, for insightfulness and a lot of work in a short amount of time.

\* Amy Birky, a welcomed-back board member, for her work on the 10th Anniversary Committee, the Constitution Committee, and facilities' scheduling for next year.

\* Carol MacDaniels for keeping the lines to NELAC, our mother organization, strong, and being there for countless details this year.

\* Dave Martin for his consistent membership support.

\* To a number of others who participated on the sidelines: Pam Trefz, Deb Nerud, Jane Neal, Peggy Williams, Paula Hanson, Liz Quinlan, and Dan Studer.

\* And to the cast and crew of the "Tangled Issue Players!"

\* Welcome new board members Linda Beckstead, Donna Jurena, and Carla Renquist Buhler.

## Minutes of the AFCON Board of Directors

**September 12, 1998**—The Board welcomed new representatives Joseph Stimpfl and Linda Beckstead.

Treasurer McMurtry reported \$2212.59 in current operating funds, survey funds, income from sales and memberships, and expenses.

Plans continue for AFCON presentations and sales tables at NLA/NEMA and NELAC conferences.

Stimpfl, ACLU-N, discussed the issue of invited speakers at public school assemblies using the forum to move from the assigned topic to witness specific theologies.

Birky, LEA, reported on Harvest of

Books which provides free books for first graders. AFCON donated \$25 to LEA for the project.

Concerning the LPS challenge of the book *A Need to Kill*, AFCON will request a copy of LPS's official response.

Cox, NELAC, reported that the AFCON Tenth Anniversary Celebration would be held at the NELAC conference, October 22. The program will include a packet of AFCON information, presentation of AFCON's Academic Freedom Awards, and a panel discussion on censorship challenges at Omaha and Lincoln schools by Dorothy

Young, Ruth Ann Lyness, and Pat Salerno.

Bender, NHSPA, reported its conference will be October 26 and AFCON is welcome to participate.

Birky presented suggested changes to the AFCON Constitution.

Krutz will name a nominating committee for candidates for 1999 AFCON offices.

The Board congratulated Gerry Cox and Carol Gulyas on their nomination for the 1998 Nebraska Humanities Council Sower Award by NCB and NLHA with support from AFCON, NELAC, and others..

(Continued to page 6.)

## Rationality and Liberty in Secondary Education

(continued from page 1.)

More specifically, participants at all ages showed little of no tolerance for cases in which (a) based on her beliefs about children, a teacher ridicules students who make mistakes or (b) based on his beliefs about girls, a father denies his daughters freedoms available to his sons. Most saw these actions as harmful or unfair to others and therefore not to be tolerated. There were substantial age differences, however, in tolerance for the underlying beliefs. Most notably, first graders were less likely than the three older groups to be tolerant of the holding and expression of the beliefs in question and more likely to be concerned that the holding or expression of these beliefs would lead to harmful action. Differences between seventh graders and college students, in contrast, were minimal: Most seventh graders and college students were tolerant not only of the holding of these beliefs but also of the expression of these beliefs, explaining that the mere expression of a belief does not harm others and/or that the exchange of opinions may generate progress toward better ideas. Wainryb et al. (under review) found similar patterns of results for dissenting views about a wide variety of topics and showed, moreover, that adolescents like college students, made reasonable judgments about when intellectual diversity should be celebrated (e.g., with regard to metaphysical beliefs) and when it should be merely tolerated (e.g., with regard to beliefs that are clearly false and potentially harmful.)

Developmental research, then, suggests that intellectual freedom is meaningful and important even in elementary schools and that there is little basis for distinguishing secondary from higher education in this regard. If our goal is to promote the construction of rationality, morality, and identity, secondary schools should provide access to multiple sources of information and should actively encourage reflection and discussion (Moshman, 1989, 1993.)

A number of educational theorists have elaborated on this general theme. Keating & Saase (1996) argue that secondary schools should actively encourage critical thinking and critical habits of mind. Dreyer (1994) proposes that secondary schools should systematically foster identity formation and that “an identify-enhancing curriculum [is one that] promotes exploration, responsible choice, and self-determination by students (p. 129.)” Lipman (1991) argues that the ideal classroom would be a “community of inquiry” in which students challenge each other to supply reasons, assist each other in drawing inferences and identifying assumptions, and coordinate their various ideas. Silverberg & Gondoli (1996,) noting the hierarchical structure of authority in secondary schools, suggest that extra-curricular activities are often more likely than the curriculum itself to permit that sort of peer interactions that foster autonomy.

Although rational constructivism is most fundamentally a metatheory of psychological development, its application to education is fully consistent with the acquisition of

traditional academic content. In a review of the literature on the use of peer groups in classrooms, for example, Cohen (1994) concludes that freedom of expression and discussion are critical to higher levels of conceptual learning. It is important to note, moreover, that rational constructivism does not preclude the direct presentation of specific facts or systematic training in particular skills (Harris & Alexander, 1998.) In fact, rational constructivism can encompass a variety of instructional strategies. What marks a rational constructivist approach is an overarching context of liberty in which students are free to disagree with what is presented and ultimately to decide for themselves what to believe.

Education for rationality must also take into account (a) the tendency to think more critically about ideas we disagree with and to shield our favored views from critical evaluation (Klaczynski, 1997; Klaczynski & Fauth, 1997; Klaczynski & Gordon, 1996a, b; Klaczynski & Narasimham, 1998; Kuhn et al., 1988; Schauble, 1996; Stanovich & West 1997; see Chapter 3) and (b) the likelihood that cultural and political assumptions widely shared by students and teachers will remain invisible and thus not be subject to critique (Comsky, 1989.) In its strongest form, education for rationality involves not just the absence of censorship but active efforts to foster a “critical spirit” (Siegel, 1988, 1997; see Chapter 3) by encouraging students to identify their fundamental assumptions and commitments and to subject these to critical evaluation (Paul, 1990.)

In sum, there is good reason to believe that restrictions on intellectual freedom are antithetical to development and education; there is no reason to believe that adolescents or secondary schools are exceptions to this general rule. Contrary to the Supreme Court’s decision in Hazelwood (1988,) secondary education is a setting that requires strict protection of, rather than special restrictions on, the right of adolescents to formulate, express, and discuss their own ideas. Ideally, secondary education would not only respect students’ rights but would actively encourage reflection, coordination, and peer interaction in order to foster the construction of rationality, morality, and identity.

### Adolescents as Young Adults

It appears that secondary school students do not differ substantially from college students in their ability to operate and profit from an environment of intellectual freedom. More generally, research discussed throughout this book suggests that, with respect to a wide range of basic psychological competencies, it is much easier to distinguish adolescents from children than to distinguish adolescents from adults.

As discussed in Chapter 11, categorical distinctions between groups of people require more than evidence of statistically significant differences. To support a categorical distinction there should be evidence that the difference between the groups is substantial compared to the diversity among and within individual members of groups. (Cont. to page 4.)

## Rationality and Liberty in Secondary Education

(continued from

page 3.)

With regard to a distinction between adolescents and children, I believe this criterion can be met. Adolescents differ from each other in their reasoning, their moral conceptions, and their theories of themselves and their worlds. Nevertheless, adolescents routinely show forms and levels of knowledge and reasoning that are rarely seen in children much before the age of about 11. These include hypothetical-deductive reasoning, explicit conceptions of inferential validity, dialectical reasoning, reflective coordinations of theories and evidence, sophisticated forms of epistemic cognition, principled forms of moral reasoning, and reflective self-conceptions (Basseches, 1984; Boyes & Chandler, 1992; Campbell & Bickhard, 1986; Chandler et al., 1990; Efkliides et al., 1994; Erikson, 1968; Franks, 1996, 1997; Inhelder & Piaget, 1958; King & Kitchener, 1994; Kohlberg, 1983; Kuhn, 1989; Marcia et al., 1993; Markovits & Vachon, 1989; Moshman, 1990a, 1993, 1998; Moshman & Franks, 1986; Overton, 1990.)

Development does continue over the course of adolescence and early adulthood and many individuals construct concepts and forms of reasoning that go far beyond the competencies they had in early adolescence. I am not aware, however, of any form or level of knowledge or reasoning that is routine among adults but rarely seen in adolescents. On the contrary, there is enormous cognitive variability among individuals beyond age 12 and it appears that age accounts for surprisingly little of this variability. Adolescents often fail to reason logically, but the same is true of adults. Adolescents often show simplistic conceptions of knowledge and primitive forms of social and moral reasoning, but so do adults. Adolescent reasoning is frequently biased but so is that of adults. Adults as well as adolescents can be found in all four of the Marcia identity statuses. Adolescents, it may be argued, are still developing, but the sorts of developmental trends seen in adolescence typically extend well into adulthood.

For the most part, then, the distinction between adolescence and adulthood is a matter of cultural

expectations and restrictions rather than a matter of intrinsic psychological characteristics. With the understanding that development is not limited to childhood, adolescence may best be construed as the first phase of adulthood. With respect to educational policy, I have suggested that one implication of this perspective is that secondary education should be more like higher education than like elementary education with respect to intellectual freedom.

### Conclusion

Rational constructivism suggests that education should be aimed at the promotion of rationality, and that rationality is promoted by intellectual freedom. It follows, then, that schools should present multiple perspectives and justifications, should facilitate student access to all viewpoints and sources of information, and should encourage students to formulate, express, discuss, and justify their own ideas. "Such a direction in schooling," notes Israel Scheffler (1997,

is fraught with risk, for it means entrusting our current conceptions to the judgment of our pupils. In exposing these conceptions to their rational evaluation we are inviting them to see for themselves whether our conceptions are adequate, proper, fair. Such a risk is central to scientific education, where we deliberately subject our current theories to the test of continuous evaluation by future generations of our student scientists. It is central also to our moral code, in so far as we ourselves take the moral point of views toward this code. And, finally, it is central to the democratic commitment which holds social policies to be continually open to free and public review. In sum, rationality liberates, but there is no liberty without risk (p. 32, italics deleted.)

How great are those risks? If we convey to adolescents the notion that they are free to believe and do what they choose because we have no basis for our own beliefs and actions, we may undermine rationality, morality, and the construction of identity. If, on the other hand, we communicate the reasons for our commitments and encourage adolescents to form justifiable commitments of their own, much of what we value will endure. To think otherwise, as the Supreme Court noted in West Virginia v. Barnette (1943, p. 641,) "is to make an unflattering estimate of the appeal of our institutions to free minds."

---

### FOR SALE BY AFCON

T-shirts with a Paul Fell "banned books" design; Sizes M, L, XL, XXL, XXXL; \$15.00. Packaging and postage: \$2.00 each.

Note cards with a Paul Fell design; \$1.50; four for \$5.00. Packaging and postage: \$0.75 per packet.

Reader's Theatre Script of a TANGLED ISSUE: Student Freedom of Expression. \$10.00 buys the rights to produce and duplicate. Packaging and postage: \$2.00 each.

Send orders to Mel Krutz, 2625 Bluff Road, Seward. NE 68434-9801

# Censorship and Challenge Survey of K-12 Public School Educators

by Jeffrey L. Lofthus

Educators across the United States daily face censorship challenges which infringe upon their academic freedom, their “right to teach, to inquire” (Parducci v. Rutland, 1970.) In Keyishian v. Board of Regents, 1967, a majority opinion stated the following:

Our nation is deeply committed to safeguarding academic freedom, which is of transcendent value to all of us and not merely to the teachers concerned. That freedom is therefore a special concern of the First Amendment, which does not tolerate laws that cast a pall of orthodoxy over the classroom. The classroom is peculiarly the marketplace of ideas.

Nebraska educators have not been spared from these same attempts by individuals and groups to censor books, materials, programs, student publications and productions, and other activities. Nebraska educators and interested others would benefit from information on the frequency and type of challenges. Such information may serve to alert concerned individuals to the prevalence and dangers such affronts to academic freedom present.

## WHO WILL RECEIVE THE SURVEY?

Early in 1999 approximately 1,200 Nebraska educators will receive a survey asking them to report challenges they have received to educational books, materials, programs, student publications and productions, and other activities. The survey will be mailed to a random sample of K-12 English and language arts teachers, student publications advisors, librarians, and administrators.

## THE SURVEY QUESTIONS

The survey will ask the respondents to identify their role in the school, such as elementary librarian or senior high English teacher and the number of years they have been in the position. They will also be asked to identify the individual or group responsible for the selection of books and other materials in their district or school.

The respondents will then be asked to answer several questions about challenges to textbooks and supplemental readings, library books, educational materials, programs, student publications and productions, and other activities. For each item, respondents will be asked to identify who made the challenge (student, parent, teacher, principal, superintendent, community group, church/religious group) and the reason for the challenge (sexual content, alternative lifestyle/sexual orientation, vulgar/obscene/inappropriate language, religious message, anti-religious message, portrayal of women/men in traditional roles, portrayal of women/men in nontraditional roles, negative portrayal of minority persons, positive portrayal of minority persons, inadequate representation of minority persons.) They will also provide the name of the item challenged, such as title of a book and the date of the challenge.

Incidents of self-censorship will be surveyed. Self-censorship results when the educator responsible for curriculum (teacher, librarian, etc.) makes a decision to change or alter books, materials, programs, student publications and productions, or other activities without following policy and procedure. Such a decision is usually made to avoid controversy.

The survey requests that respondents provide a narrative of a specific challenge they have faced or are aware of in their school or district. Survey respondents are also asked to enclose a copy of their school’s or district’s policy and related forms that address challenges and the same for adoption of educational books, materials, programs, student publications and productions, or other activities. If the school or district does not have such policy and procedure in place, respondents are asked to provide a narrative describing how such a challenge would be handled.

The survey is anonymous. Respondents are, though, provided an opportunity to identify themselves if they wish to provide additional information about a challenge or for another reason.

## CREATION OF THE SURVEY

The survey was created by this author and greatly improved by suggestions by Drs. John Bender and Mel Krutz and other Academic Freedom Coalition of Nebraska (AFCON) executive board members. The survey was originally generated for this author’s dissertation research and was used in North Dakota. Besides gathering valuable data on censorship and challenge activities in North Dakota, the respondents offered numerous narratives on the chilling effect that the challenges had on their communities, districts, schools, and on their own efforts to provide students with the educational experiences they deemed appropriate.

## SURVEY FUNDING

The cost of duplication and mailing, etc., of the survey is expected to exceed \$1,500.00 Interested groups or individuals wishing to contribute to the cost of the survey are encouraged to contact AFCON at the address on the back of this newsletter. Funding for the survey at this point has been provided by AFCON with specific funding from the following organizational members:

- > American Association of University Professors (AAUP),  
University of Nebraska at Lincoln (UNL)
- > American Association of University Professors (AAUP),  
Nebraska State Conference
- > Nebraska English Language and Arts Council  
(NELAC)
- > Nebraska High School Press Association (NHSPA)
- > Nebraska State Education Association (NSEA)

Please encourage your educator members to respond to the survey when it arrives and thus provide helpful data and information for educators and interested others statewide.

**AFCON BOARD MINUTES**

(Continued from page 2.)

Moshman announced the ACLU Bill of Rights Dinner is in Lincoln November 13 and Mel Krutz will receive the annual Defender of the Bill of Rights Award.

**October 10, 1998**—Bob Haller, Nominating Committee chair, reported Joseph Stimpfl, President-Elect, and Cathi McMurtry, Treasurer, have accepted nomination.

The annual AFCON meeting will be at the University Club, Lincoln, November 13 at 5:00 PM. AFCON will place an ad in the ACLU program for the dinner.

Lofthus circulated a draft for a recruitment brochure. It will be sent to organizations who have an interest in academic freedom to solicit their membership.

AFCON will present its Academic Freedom Awards at the NELAC Conference October 22 to Jim Griess, Rev. Dr. Otis Young, and Gerry Cox for their continuing efforts in support of intellectual freedom, and at the NHSPA Conference to Linda Beckstead for her defense of intellectual freedom rights for student journalists at Bellevue West High School.

Krutz announced that John Bender wishes to be replaced as the representative of the UNL Faculty Senate. Haller will find a replacement.

The board will devise a plan to recognize the achievements and

contributions of outgoing board members.

The Tenth Anniversary Committee is preparing a packet of information to distribute at the AFCON Tenth Anniversary Celebration at the October 22 NELAC Conference. It will include a history of AFCON, copies of policy statements from each AFCON member organization, and a thank you to NELAC for its initiation in the creation of AFCON.

Hosts for the AFCON tables at the NLA/NEMA Conference in Grand Island are Deb Nerud, Paula Hansen, Ardis Moody, Mel Krutz, and Tom Black.

Stimpfl, ACLU-N, reported on the precedent being set in the David Cash case.

Black, NSEA, urged members to vote against Initiative 413 because of its threat to public education in Nebraska. Stimpfl and Black will check into an AFCON/ACLU-N/NSEA partnership on church/state issues as they pertain to religion and public schools.

Birky, LEA, will get AFCON news into the LEA Newsletters.

**November 13**—McMurtry showed \$815.62 in the operating budget; \$1365.00 in the Survey Fund.

Krutz reported 46 (\$690) T-shirts, \$98.50 in note cards, and \$50 in Tangled Issue scripts have been sold. The seed money borrowed to start fundraising has been raised.

New representatives on the AFCON board are Donna Jurena, NLA, and Carla Renquist Buhler, UNL Faculty

Senate.

AFCON members, Gerry Cox and Jerry Kromberg, have been added to the board of the Center for the Book.

Linda Beckstead reported for the NHSPA on incidents of censorship at Beatrice, Waverly, and Gering journalism programs. The NHSPA voted to promote the Student Freedom of Expression Bill to the Unicameral. AFCON offered assistance and possible presentations of the playette "Tangled Issues," of the Hazelwood decision, and of intellectual freedom.

Black, NSEA, reported a recent Harris Poll that placed teachers at the top of a list of persons one can trust. He also presented samples of certificates of appreciation.

Krutz read a thank you letter from Dan Studer, LEA President, for AFCON's contribution to the Harvest Of Books project. The very successful project gave three books, not one, to each first grade student.

Moshman reported on revisions of the AFCON statement of purpose which were approved by the board.

Krutz reported that she sent information about the organization of AFCON to the Omaha World-Herald which had inquired about the Academic Freedom Award nominees. She circulated the latest MAD Magazine "Joy of Censorship Update" and information about their video. AFCON will purchase a copy.

Krutz, Birky, and Black formed a committee to revise the AFCON constitution.

**ACLU-N  
Defender of the Bill of Rights Award  
November 1998  
Mel Krutz**

Dr. Mel Krutz, President of the Academic Freedom Coalition of Nebraska, has been an activist for intellectual freedom in Nebraska schools for many years and was the catalyst for the formation of AFCON in 1987-1988. On a statewide basis, Mel is arguably Nebraska's foremost proponent of the First Amendment rights of students and teachers.

**AFCON  
October 1998 Academic Freedom Awards**

for their continuing efforts to preserve intellectual freedom

**Jim Griess**

Nebraska State Education Association Executive Director

**Otis Young**

Pastor at First Plymouth Church of Christ, Lincoln

**Linda Beckstead**

Senior High Journalism Teacher, Bellevue

**Gerry Cox**

Retired Senior High English Teacher, Lincoln

# AFCON

515 North Thomas Avenue  
Oakland, NE 68045.

Mailing  
Address  
Label

---

## ACADEMIC FREEDOM COALITION OF NEBRASKA

### HELP AFCON PROMOTE ACADEMIC FREEDOM

As a member of AFCON, you can help us

- ◆ support applications of the First Amendment in academic contexts, including elementary and secondary schools, colleges, universities, and libraries.
- ◆ educate Nebraskans about the meaning and value of intellectual freedom, intellectual diversity, mutual respect, open communication, and uninhibited pursuit of knowledge, including the role of these ideals in academic contexts and in democratic self-government.
- ◆ assist students, teachers, librarians, and researchers confronted with censorship, indoctrination, or suppression of ideas.
- ◆ act as liaison among groups in Nebraska that support academic freedom.

**MEMBERSHIP** (To become a member, send dues, organization or individual name, address, and phone number to Cathi McMurtry, 515 N. Thomas Avenue, Oakland, NE 68045)

**Organizational Membership** (\$100) entitles the organization to one seat on the AFCON Executive Committee and one vote in the election of officers and at the annual meeting, provides newsletter subscription for the board member to share with the organization's information director and reduced rates to AFCON conferences for its members.

**Organizational Affiliation** (\$25) provides newsletter subscription and reduced rates to AFCON conferences for its members.

**Individual Membership** (\$10) provides newsletter subscription, eligibility for office and for chairing standing committees, reduced rates for AFCON conferences, and one vote at annual meetings.

**Student Membership** (\$5) entitles full-time students to the same privileges as provided by the Individual Membership.

**AFCON ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERS, PLEASE DUPLICATE THIS NEWSLETTER FOR YOUR MEMBERS.  
INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS, PLEASE PASS THIS NEWSLETTER TO A FRIEND AFTER YOU HAVE READ IT.  
ENCOURAGE HIM OR HER TO JOIN AFCON.**