



THE

# AFCON

SENTINEL



Volume XV, Number 3

A Quarterly of the Academic Freedom Coalition of Nebraska

September 16, 2011

## AFCON OFFICERS

Rod Wagner  
President

Laurie Thomas Lee  
President-Elect

Linda Parker  
Immediate Past  
President

Peggy Adair  
Secretary

Cathi McMurtry  
Treasurer

David Moshman  
Policy Coordinator

Peggy Adair  
Legislative Liaison

Robert Brooke  
Webmaster

Linda Parker  
AFCON Archivist

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.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—Rod Wagner

### Go Ahead – Read a Banned Book!

The Republic High School in Missouri recently banned from the curriculum and removed from the school library Kurt Vonnegut’s 1969 novel, *Slaughterhouse-Five*. The school board chose to remove the book for creating “false conceptions of American history and government or that teach principles contrary to Biblical morality and truth.” This is not a new experience for this particular book. *Slaughterhouse-Five* is on the American Library Association’s list of “100 Most Frequently Challenged Books: 1990-1999” at number 67. Book banning is a never ending story. To remind all that the freedom to read is a cherished right, and to warn that the right to read is under constant challenge, each year the last week of September is declared as Banned Books Week – Celebrating the Freedom to Read.

Schools and libraries are always under the threat of censorship efforts. Many resist and some don’t. It takes conviction and courage to resist censorship efforts. Those attempting to remove books from libraries or from a school curriculum are often zealous in their efforts, convinced that the targeted book is so objectionable that it should be unavailable. Were it not for the efforts of librarians, teachers, booksellers and other right to read supporters many more books would be banned.

Banning books has an unintended conse-

quence for the book banner. Attempts to ban books often lead to a sudden and increased interest in the challenged book. It’s great for authors, publishers, bookstores and libraries. More books are sought, sold and borrowed. The Republic High School’s removal of *Slaughterhouse-Five* resulted in its own unintended consequence. The Vonnegut Memorial Library, located in Indianapolis, offered up to 150 copies of the book to the Missouri students whose school decided they shouldn’t read it. An anonymous donor covered the cost. The response has been so overwhelming that the Vonnegut library is using additional donations for a banned book exhibit and a Banned Book Response Team to aid communities facing book ban challenges. The library also created a toolkit to share.

The American Library Association’s Office for Intellectual Freedom (OIF) is one of the most valued sources for librarians, teachers, and others to find resources and support to address censorship challenges. The OIF can even provide legal assistance in some situations. The Freedom to Read Foundation is an American Library Association affiliated organization created as a First Amendment legal defense organization. Nebraska sources for censorship challenges include the Academic Freedom Coalition of Nebraska, American Civil Liberties Union of Nebraska, and the Nebraska Library Association’s Intellectual Freedom

(See the **President**, page 2)

## Upcoming Events

AFCON Board Meetings, **October 8, November 12, and December 10, 2011**  
Loren Eiseley Library, 1530 Superior, Lincoln, Nebraska; 10 AM

## THE PRESIDENT

(Continued from Page 1.)  
Committee. These organizations and others promote the freedom to read and can help in various ways in response to book challenges.

The Missouri high school's banning of Vonnegut's *Slaughterhouse-Five* reminds me that it has been a long while since I read it. I'm sure I have a copy. If not, I know that I

can find one at my local public library. It's my book of choice to read during this year's Banned Book Week. What's yours?

## Summaries of AFCON Board of Directors' Meetings—Peggy Adair

**June 11, 2011—**

**Present:** Rod Wagner (president), Cathi McMurtry (treasurer), Dave Moshman (policy coordinator), Linda Parker (past president), board members Nancy Comer and Dwayne Ball

**Minutes** of the May board meeting, and the treasurer's report showing \$4206 on balance were approved.

**Sentinel** is expected to be distributed this week by Bob Haller, after production by Tom Black.

### Membership reports:

*Nebraska Library Association:* Linda Parker is now head of the NLA Intellectual Freedom Committee, and reports that the NLA intends to celebrate Banned Books Week this September. A discussion was held as to whether AFCON and the ACLU, who usually collaborate on a an event during Banned Books Week, might collaborate with the NLA on this. Dwayne will contact Laurie Lee to see if she wants to coordinate. Also, the NLA will be holding its annual meeting October 5-7 at the Cornhusker Hotel in Lincoln, and AFCON will possibly have a table staffed by Linda Parker, Karen Drevo, and Rod Wagner.

*Nebraska Center for the Book:* will host a performance of "Local Wonders" based on the Ted Kooser book, at the Lied Center in Lincoln, Oct. 22, 2011.

### AFCON annual meeting in late

**Fall:** Laurie Lee (not present) conveyed her interest in getting ideas for the theme of the program. Several were discussed. One notion was to have another controversial speaker along the lines of Bill Ayers, but this time from the opposite side of the political spectrum, such as David Horowitz (Academic Bill of Rights at the university level) or Michelle Rhee (former Chancellor of the Washington DC school system and an advocate of eliminating school-teacher tenure). Another was to focus around civics education in the public schools, but to find ways to make the issue more of a draw. Another notion was to have a debate or program with a starting point about the problem of lack of civic participation (as in Putnam's Bowling alone), and the extent to which the schools

can, or should, encourage this. Ball will convey ideas to Lee.

**AFCON academic freedom film contest:** to be held Spring 2012.

**Academic Freedom Award:** to be presented at the annual meeting; we need nominations in July!

**Next Meeting:** July 9, Eiseley Library, Lincoln, Nebraska; 10 AM.

**July 9, 2011—**

**Present:** Peggy Adair, Nancy Comer, Bob Haller, Laurie Thomas Lee, Lora Leibrandt, Cathi McMurtry, David Moshman, Linda Parker, Rod Wagner.

**AGENDA:** Agenda was approved as presented.

**MINUTES:** Minutes of the AFCON board meeting held on June 11, 2011, kindly written by Dwayne Ball, were reviewed. Upon a motion by Moshman and second by Parker, the minutes were approved with one correction, the spelling of the name "Ayes," which should read "Ayers." Motion carried on voice vote. Special thanks to Ball for filling in as secretary in June.

**REASURER'S REPORT:** The Treasurer's report dated July 8, 2011 was reviewed and filed for audit. Balance on hand as of July 8 is \$4,044.07. McMurtry also provided the board with information about an article in *NEA Today* by Sandra Day O'Connor, titled "How Can We Revive Civics Education?" The retired Supreme Court Justice also actively supports a student-focused website, [www.ourcourts.org](http://www.ourcourts.org).

**PRESIDENT'S REPORT:** Wagner reported AFCON has been accepted to present at the NLA/NEMA fall conference that will be held October 5-7. Wagner asked Parker and Leibbrandt to help in developing a presentation.

**WEBSITE:** Website coordinator Robert Brooke asks that AFCON members send photos and news items to him for inclusion on the website. [rbrooke1@unlnotes.unl.edu](mailto:rbrooke1@unlnotes.unl.edu)

**SENTINEL:** Articles for the AFCON *Sentinel* should be sent to Tom Black by **August 22, 2011**. The next issue of the *Sentinel* will be available on September 10, 2011. [wpc6296@cableone.net](mailto:wpc6296@cableone.net)

**POLICY COORDINATOR:** Moshman reviewed and discussed the ramifications of the recent Supreme Court ruling in favor of First Amendment rights of children to view violent content in video games.

**LEGISLATIVE REPORT:** Adair had nothing new to report.

**ACADEMIC FREEDOM CONTEST:** Lee will meet with ACLU to discuss parameters of a partnership with AFCON to co-sponsor the contest. The board discussed having a first-place prize of \$100, second-place prize of \$50, and 5 third-place prizes of \$25 each. The teacher of the first-place prize winner will receive a flip-cam. The board also discussed providing certificates to each of the student winners.

**NOMINATING COMMITTEE REPORT:** The nominating committee reported they are still working on the president-elect position. Adair and McMurtry have agreed to serve another term as secretary and treasurer respectively.

**BOARD DIRECTORY:** Adair will email an updated AFCON directory to board members.

**ANNUAL MEETING:** Parker will explore the possibility of Sandra Day O'Connor as a speaker for the annual meeting, and if not, will see if O'Connor may be available sometime next spring for a joint conference with other organizations interested in civic learning. The board noted November 12 and November 19 are away football game dates, so these dates are good possibilities for the annual meeting.

**ACADEMIC FREEDOM AWARDS:** The board asks all AFCON members to send suggestions for recipients of the AFCON Academic Freedom Award to any board member. The board will take up further discussion of the AFCON Awards at the September meeting.

**There was no August meeting, thus there were no minutes.**

**NEXT MEETING:** The next meeting of the **AFCON BOARD OF DIRECTORS** will be **Saturday, September 10, 2011** at 10:00 a.m. in **Eiseley Library, Lincoln.**

## Letter-to-the-Editor

I am writing because I was appalled by Dwayne Ball's report on a potential change to the evidentiary standards required for universities to take disciplinary action in alleged rape cases on college campuses. Professor Ball's position, that the changes would unnecessarily endanger the careers and lives of the accused men by opening them to wrongful convictions and punishments by university justice boards, seems well worth considering. Unjustly expelling men from college based on false allegations of sexual misconduct would indeed be a travesty of justice, and the potential for this occurrence should be taken into account during debates over how to handle such cases. What I found appalling was the complete lack of recognition that rape and sexual violence by men against women on college campuses is an extremely serious issue as well, and that our current system of reporting and prosecution of this crime (and other acts of sexual violence committed on campuses) is entirely inadequate. A 2000 report commissioned by the Department of Justice on the sexual victimization of women on college campuses\* found that as many as one in five women will be raped on our campuses each year, and one in four will have experiences that meet the legal definition of rape or attempted rape. 95% of those will not be reported. The reasons why women do not report their rapes or attempted rapes relates directly to the questions raised and the attitude displayed in Professor Ball's

report. 42% of completed rape victims did not report the incident to the police for "lack of proof that [the] incident happened." Surely this statistic should also be considered when reporting on the potential impact of changes in evidentiary standards for sexual violence cases on campuses? 25-27% of completed rape victims did not report the incident to the police because they feared that the police would not "think it was serious enough," not "want to be bothered," or would treat them with hostility. 6% worried about being treated with hostility by other parts of the justice system. I would submit that the prospect of having someone on a college disciplinary board whose primary concern when confronted with such a case was determining whether the young woman was "filing false charges out of malice" because she "held a grudge against a young man who dumped her" and was simply ginning up a "good long sob and a bit of perjury" in order to ruin a young man's prospects in life proves that these young women are right to fear that they will not be treated well by parts of the justice system. There is widespread evidence that police departments hold similar attitudes and fulfill victims' fears about dismissive or hostile treatment. Women themselves are influenced by this widespread dismissive attitude towards sexual assault. In contrast to the malicious female accuser invoked in Professor Ball's article, actual rape victims tend to give their rapists the benefit of the doubt, with 44% of women not reporting because it wasn't clear

to them that their rape constituted a crime or because they did not believe that harm was intended.

None of these statistics on the actions and beliefs of actual rape victims eliminates the potential for a woman to fabricate rape charges out of whole cloth for malicious purposes. But until the 20% of collegiate men who report "becoming so sexually aroused that they could not stop themselves from having sex," even though the woman did not consent are in fact disciplined in some way, and the 35% of men who report some likelihood that they would rape if they could be assured they wouldn't be caught or punished are assured that they will in fact be caught and punished—in short, until the percentage sexual violence against collegiate women falls and the number of women who avoid reporting their rapes because of 'lack of proof the incident happened' falls from 42% to 0%, then the least we can do is take the issue of evidentiary standards in rape cases on campus seriously. For both sexes.

\* Statistics are taken from *US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Violence Against Women Office. The Sexual Victimization of College Women—Bonnie S. Fisher, Francis T. Cullen, Michael G. Turner. Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2000.* [www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/182369.pdf](http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/182369.pdf). Note that statistics on why women do not report their rapes or attempted rapes will not equal 100% as respondents were permitted to include more than one response when citing their reasons.

Julia E. Schleck  
jschleck2@unlnotes.unl.edu  
Associate Professor  
Department of English, UNL

## UNIVERSITY REPORTS

by Dwayne Ball

Well, somebody reads this column! Julia Schleck has a response to one of the stories in University Reports in the last issue. Her response is published in this issue. (See Page 3.) In this story, I pointed out that, “If the U.S. Department of Education Office of Civil Rights (OCR) has its way, many young university men may find themselves victimized by false or inflated charges of sexual misconduct, including rape, made against them by angry women. It could happen like this: the OCR wants to change the standard of proof that universities use in case of sexual misconduct from ‘clear and convincing’ evidence – i.e., something close to the ‘beyond a reasonable doubt’ standard used in criminal trials – to the ‘preponderance of evidence’ standard used in civil cases. In other words, a woman making charges of rape against a man at a university would have to meet the same stand-

ards used to adjudicate parking tickets, if she wanted the university to expel him...” I pointed out that with adroit use of the new standards, a good well-told story, and the usual politically-correct university judicial system, a young woman with revenge on her mind for something other than sexual violence could destroy a young man’s life.

While admitting that I had a point, Ms. Schleck cites statistics regarding the damage done to young women due to sexual violence on campus, and advocates that the standards of proof be considered, although she stops short of advocacy for lowering standards. She does, however, make good points that much sexual violence goes unreported because the required proof is not there, or young women fear they will not be taken seriously by police or courts.

As a faculty advisor, I have talked to young women who were anguished victims of sexual violence they did not report for those very reasons, and I would dearly love to see those attackers properly punished. But, we need to be aware that whenever standards of proof are lowered, innocent people suffer. A simple glance at history will show that: Venice at the time of the Doges, quite a number of countries in the 20<sup>th</sup> century when repressive right- or left-wing governments came to power, and even our own campuses across the U.S. under many current sexual harassment codes. I have also heard the stories of anguished men falsely accused, you see. Our criminal court system has the right idea when dealing with those accused of a serious crime: the accused is innocent until shown guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Trampling on due process is no answer.

## What Can’t You Say in the Huffington Post?

By David Moshman

*Below is an analysis I sent to the Huffington Post on May 15, 2011, to be posted on my blog concerning intellectual freedom in education (<http://www.huffingtonpost.com/david-moshman/>). All of my posts address controversial issues but no other post has ever been rejected. On May 26, after my third query, I was informed by email that this post would not be published. No explanation was provided. Apparently, my analysis of what you can't say about Israel itself falls into the category of things you can't say about Israel.*

*“Extraordinary social constraints on public discussion about Israel,” concludes the analysis, “have created a dangerous divide between scholarly research and public knowledge.” In censoring this summary of a scholarly exchange, the Huffington Post has pro-*

*vided additional evidence for this proposition.*

### **What Can’t You Say About Israel? Kushner, CUNY, and Intellectual Freedom**

On May 2, the Board of Trustees of the City University of New York (CUNY) rejected a decision by the faculty of CUNY’s John Jay College to honor playwright Tony Kushner for his theatrical work by awarding him an honorary degree. His removal from the list of honorees came after trustee Jeffrey Wiesenfeld argued that Kushner’s beliefs about Israel fell outside the permissible bounds of political debate.

On May 9, the executive committee of the Trustees, responding to an outcry from within CUNY and far beyond, unanimously reversed course. Kushner is now scheduled to receive his honorary degree on June 3.

The issue, to be clear, was not Kushner’s unquestioned First Amendment right to say whatever he believes about Israel. The issue was the academic freedom of the CUNY faculty to make academic decisions on academic grounds. The CUNY Board had no expertise to independently evaluate Kushner’s artistic accomplishments and no legitimate reason to consider his political views and activities.

(See **Huffington**, page 5.)

(Huffington, from page 4.)

But in addition to the academic freedom issue, there is also a larger issue of intellectual freedom in public discourse. This case is just one of many concerning limits on what may be said about Israel.

Consider one example of what lies out of bounds. Among Kushner's most serious offenses was holding and expressing the belief that Israel was created through a process of ethnic cleansing. Trustee Wiesenfeld deemed this belief so obviously false as to be an anti-Semitic slur beyond the bounds of legitimate discussion.

Scholars, in contrast, would say that Kushner is correct. Historical research since the 1980s has established that the Zionist founders of Israel engaged in a deliberate process of ethnic cleansing to create a Jewish-majority state. What remains in dispute is whether this ethnic cleansing is best characterized as genocide.

An excellent example of the current scholarly debate can be found in a recent issue of the *Journal of Genocide Research* (Sept.-Dec. 2010). In a special "Discussion" section, the journal's editors introduce an exchange between the distinguished genocide scholars Martin Shaw and Omer

Bartov entitled "The question of genocide in Palestine, 1948."

Shaw, the author of *What is Genocide?* (2007), argues that genocide must be distinguished from war and from "forms of oppression or repression that fall short of genocide." What distinguishes genocide is "the destructive character of the anti-group policy." In other words, "genocidal action aims not just to contain, control, or subordinate a population, but to shatter and break up its social existence."

Ethnic cleansing, in Shaw's view, is intrinsically genocidal; the term serves as a euphemism for what is more accurately called genocide. The facts of 1948, he argues, reveal a pattern of deliberate destruction that qualifies as genocide.

Bartov, author of several books about the Holocaust, argues that for the concept of genocide to be meaningful it must include more than just the Holocaust but less than all the terrible events of history. Shaw's conception of genocide is so broad, he argues, as to be meaningless and useless.

Bartov "completely" agrees with Shaw that Israel must "come to terms with and concede that it expelled or caused the flight of some 750,000 Palestinians in 1948." But application of the term

genocide to this event serves to delegitimize Israel rather than to clarify what happened. Ethnic cleansing, in his view, is the proper term.

The contrast between the discussion in the genocide literature and the discussion in the CUNY boardroom is striking. Of course there is more to be said, and we all have a right to say what we believe. This includes those such as trustee Wiesenfeld who deny, in the face of all evidence, that Israel was created in a process of ethnic cleansing.

But the case of Kushner's honorary degree reminds us why universities must not be subject to the personal and political biases of their trustees. And it reminds us, once again, that extraordinary social constraints on public discussion about Israel have created a dangerous divide between scholarly research and public knowledge.

-----  
*AFCON Policy Coordinator David Moshman is a professor of educational psychology at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln and the author of Liberty & Learning: Academic Freedom for Teachers and Students.*

---

## Doug Paterson Wins Theatre Award

*The letter below was circulated on August 8, 2011. Doug Paterson is a former member of the AFCON Board of Directors, representing the UNO Faculty Senate, and served as President of AFCON throughout 2007.*

Dear Colleagues, Alumni and Friends:

The UNO Department of Theatre is proud to announce that the Association for Theatre in Higher Education (ATHE) has selected our own Dr. Doug Paterson for a very distinguished award. The

award honors a person whose career represents Leadership in Community-Based Theatre and Community Engagement. We can think of no one more deserving of this award than Doug Paterson.

(See **Paterson**, page 6.).

(Paterson, from page 5.)

Doug has made community-based theatre his passion since the middle 70's when he and an energized five created the Dakota Theatre Caravan in South Dakota. (See his Drama Review article, "Theatre for a People". Summer 1983. 3 - 14.) Doug suspended his work in 1985 while the company continued through 1989.

In 1983, while still working summers with the Caravan, Doug gather students and faculty from our University of Nebraska at Omaha to begin The Circle Theatre, known in the 1980's and 1990's for their Diner Theatre. The Circle Theatre continues its work in Omaha to this day. As an upstart member of the new ATHE at the 1988 Conference in San Diego, Doug petitioned the organization to help network the theatre activists in ATHE by starting the Theatre and Social Change Forum Group, approved by the ATHE Board for the 1989 Conference in New York. Doug was asked by ATHE to organize the 1992 National Conference in Atlanta, and at the 1991 Conference in Seattle he saw the first demonstration of work called the Theatre of the Oppressed.

The work so stunned him in its simplicity, engagement, power, and pure fun that after the Conference he dashed back to Omaha and called TO's founder, Augusto Boal, asking him to give workshops at and Keynote the 1992 Atlanta Conference. Theatre of the Oppressed began to carve a new channel in US academic and especially community-based theatre. Boal and Doug's working relationship led to Doug bringing Boal to UNO to offer a workshop. Sixty people participated in the workshop and over 100 signed up to witness the 5 hour event. The result was an explosion of enthusiasm and interest, and the first seed of the Pedagogy and Theatre of the Oppressed Conferences. During his professional leave in 1994 and 1995, Doug, with the help of many people in the Omaha region, organized what would become the first of many PTO Conferences. Weaving the praxis of Boal and educational revolutionary Paulo Freire, the Conference has just completed its 17th incarnation in Chicago. While Doug is less central to the organization now, he remains an emeritus

member of the PTO Board and helps as much as he can. Active TO work has led Doug to create one theatre in Omaha, OPTIONS, Omaha Public Theatre in Our Neighborhoods, and to give many national and international workshop residencies and/or presentations including in the countries of Brazil, Australia, Canada, Israel, Iraq, Liberia, India, Palestine, and Croatia.

It is perhaps appropriate to speculate that the ATHE award for Leadership in Community-Based Theatre and Civic Engagement is perhaps due to Doug's determined organizing within ATHE to recognize this emerging form of theatre practice as well as his wider efforts in both production and Conference organizing. Regardless, we celebrate his many achievements as a local, regional, national, and international leader in Community-Based Theatre and congratulate him on work well done over the last thirty-five years.

Sincerely, D. Scott Glasser  
Chair & Associate Professor  
UNO Department of Theatre

---

## Professionalism and Academic Freedom

Dr. Robert Haller, Professor Emeritus of English, UNL

I once wrote an article about the Latin poems of the 12<sup>th</sup> century which were structured as debates about the question, Which makes the best lover, a Knight or a Clerk?

Understand that a "clerk" would be a scholar, member of the clergy whose learning qualified him to advise a ruler, handle a parish or teach at a university.

The satirical force of the poem lay in the fact that every quality that made the clerk the superior lover was a violation of those (See **Professionalism**. Page 7.)

(**Professionalism**, from page 6.)

principles which gave value to the calling of a clerk: luxury, self-indulgence, the willingness to use his learning and position in the world to his personal advantage.

The poem, in other words, is not seriously proposing that either Clerks or Knights should focus on becoming qualified to love; it is a document in the attempt to promote Chivalry and Clergy, the professionalizing of military and intellectual careers, or callings.

The professionalizing of knighthood was not entirely successful, because the requirements of earning a living serving a particular lord whose interests and policies might undermine professional values and because non-professional participation in military ventures often led to unchivalric behavior. Those advocating the profession were not romantics; they took seriously the idea of chivalric autonomy and the public beneficial purposes of warfare, and the character and skill of their best practitioners.

When Edward III of England established the Order of the Garter, he opened up membership to all nations and to all levels of gentility. But warfare, even as carried out by Edward III, was for keeps. Knights might sometimes avoid fighting a "brother-in-arms" in the opposing forces, or keep an oath to report themselves as captives to be ransomed to the commander of the opposing forces. But honorable actions were always vol-

untary and not always carried out as chivalry required.

But the professionalizing of Clergy was more successful, at least insofar as it was embodied in the universities established throughout Europe from 1200 on. Not making gentle birth a requirement for admission, intellectual accomplishment was open to the ambitious and intelligent of all classes. Institutionalized as autonomous voluntary communities, "colleges" and "universities" received patronage because their integrity was seen as the means to articulate the intellectual, legal and theological foundations of Western society in a manner which was not factional or parochial. Within their closed society, they assigned their members to their earned degrees: a Bachelor could join in formal dispute, a Master could direct a course of study, a Doctor could be appealed to for an authoritative judgment. The accomplishments of the major universities seemed impressive in comparison to the random output of leaders in religious orders or cathedral chapters.

Universities were thus able to professionalize law and medicine, and to a degree, philosophy and theology. Church leaders and secular government officials brought their disputes to universities, believing that their discipline and their disinterestedness assured a fair and serviceable settlement of disputes about doctrine, law and governance. Intellectual work, and the institutions where it was pursued, were famous and prestigious. Everyone knew that Oxford and the Sorbonne were integral to the

good order and glory of the kingdom.

These assertions need a lot of further discussion, but what I have said above is in general true enough to support a couple of observations about academic freedom in our day. It is still the case that Academic Freedom, Tenure, and Shared Governance are the principles that create the integrity of an educational institution. Even public Universities are still protected by constitutional provisions and the authority of Regents. And it is clear to the members of AFCON, but not to the general public, that comparable principles are essential to education at all levels. But K-12 public (and private) educators are often told to indoctrinate, are threatened with arbitrary firing and subject to autocratic governance. An institution entirely dependent on public or church financing will always have difficulty creating the conditions of professionalism. It is certainly the case that most popular "reforms" undermine professional integrity, and it may be the case that unions undermine rather than enhance professional integrity.

What history tells me is that, lacking the conditions of autonomy and self-governance, only heroic professional integrity in individuals joined in the collegial recognition of the importance of intellectual work to their students and our society can create the kind of freedom our schools need.

---

**AFCON SPEAKER'S BUREAU** (As of December 2007)

Peggy Adair: "Banned Books, Black Arm-bands, and School Prayer: The Evolution of Children's First Amendment Rights in America"

padair@tconl.com

Dwayne Ball: "Threats to Academic Freedom at Universities"

adball@neb.rr.com

Bob Haller: "Civics Education and the Practice of Freedom" and "How Books Can Harm You: Lessons from the Censors"

rhaller1@unl.edu

David Moshman: "Principles of Academic Freedom"

dmoshman1@unl.edu

John Bender and David Moshman: "Student Freedom of Expression/Student Rights"

jbender1@unl.edu

dmoshman1@unl.edu

Laurie Thomas Lee: "Implications of the USA Patriot Act"

llee1@unl.edu

---

Presentation of the Readers' Theatre production of A Tangled Web: Student Freedom of Expression.

(a cast of adults and students)

---

**ADDRESS FOR THE AFCON WEB SITE**

**<http://www.nebafcon.org>**

**Check it out and learn Who We Are and about Our Activities; read our Constitution; learn how to Join Us; see the where and when of our Meetings; meet our Members and Officers;**

**REQUEST FOR NEWS FOR FUTURE ISSUES**

The editor of the AFCON SENTINEL invites all AFCON individual and organizational members to send news about academic freedom issues in Nebraska or editorial comments for inclusion in this newsletter and/or announcements of organizational meetings for the UPCOMING EVENTS column.

**Due date for submissions to the December 2011 issue is NOVEMBER 21, 2011.**

Send to Tom Black, editor, 610 West Park, West Point, NE 68788 or wpc6296@cableone.net



# 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** (\$120) entitles the organization to one seat on the AFCON Board, one vote in the election of officers and at the annual meeting, eligibility for office and chairing standing committees, provides newsletter subscription for the board member to share with the organization's information director, and reduced rates to AFCON conferences for its members.

**Individual Membership** (\$15) 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**