

# Socializing Homogenous Ideologies: Academia's Freedom Hypocrisy

Brett J. Holt

University of Vermont, USA

## Abstract

*This manuscript contextualizes and operationalizes the history of modern academic freedom. Historically, the tenets of modern academic freedoms began with Willem von Humboldt and resulted in the commitments to academic freedoms made by the American Association of University Professors. The current social/ideological climate is presented to the reader and the author reports on the methods colleges and universities use to socialize the campus community into a homogenous ideological viewpoint. This manuscript details how individuals who fail to conform to the homogenous ideologies or engage in discourses differing from the college/university are subjugated to punitive measures, sometimes resulting in the ultimate intolerance (expulsion/termination from the institution). Finally, this manuscript discusses the overall implications of suppressing academic freedoms and concludes with the author's final thoughts.*

## 1. Introduction

This manuscript will discuss how academic freedoms are encroached upon by colleges and universities socializing faculty and students into a form of ideological conformity. Holt [1] identified six threats to academic freedoms and this manuscript will explore one of those six threats: the concept of socialized conformity or ideological homogeneity. Frey and Stevens [2] state "When an authority figure punishes an individual's expression, this signals to the rest of a community what can be said and discussed openly and what is beyond the pale." First, a short history of modern academic freedom will be discussed. Next, the manuscript will explain how certain topics have become unwanted on college campuses. In order to remove unwanted topics, universities engage in a socialization process that sends a message to faculty and students that certain discourses are undesirable unless you agree with the authorities' ideology. If the topics are still breached by faculty or students, then the colleges and universities encroach on freedoms through attempts at punitive measures. This author will articulate final thoughts with the assault on

academic freedom through attempts at socialized conformity and ideological homogeneity.

## 2. Academic Freedom

Lehrfreiheit is defined as the freedom to teach and lernfreiheit is defined as freedom to learn [3]. Willem von Humboldt brought the concepts of lehrfreiheit and lernfreiheit to public attention in the early 1800's through the creation of a university in Berlin. Humboldt's university, which was neither loyal to a government or religious institution, became popular throughout Europe due to the commitment it had for established academic freedoms. Foreign academics, especially sought to visit and study at a university where loyalties to religious organizations and political organizations were abandoned for commitment to academic inquiry and study [4].

The rise of two totalitarian regimes (communism and fascism) along with both World Wars in the early 1900's created a backlash against academic freedom throughout Europe. Institutions that once advocated for academic freedoms began to create antithetical policies. Institutions throughout the Americas were, however, beginning to form organizations that would advocate for academic freedoms on a new continent. The most prominent organization in the Americas was founded in 1915 as the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). Thereby, concepts of lehrfreiheit and lernfreiheit were being preserved in North American universities during these threatening times [5].

Commanger [3] claims that the concepts of lehrfreiheit and lernfreiheit became popular throughout the world and established a basis for academic freedom. Dea [4] describes how AAUP (and then the United Nations in 1997) committed to defining academic freedoms as: 1) the freedom to teach, 2) the freedom to learn, 3) the freedom of inquiry, and 4) the freedom of both intramural and extramural expression.

Nelson [6] offers more detailed and specific characteristics regarding academic freedom. Nelson's [6] characteristics are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Characteristics of Academic Freedom [6]

| <i>AF Allows:</i>  | <i>AF Does Not:</i>   |
|--|---|
| Engagement in intellectual debate without fear of censorship.  | Allow one to threaten, harass, intimidate, ridicule or impose views on others   |
| Right to remain true to a pedagogical philosophy and intellectual commitments.                                   | Provide the right of non-mastery of content.                                    |
| Comparison/contrasts between subject and any field of human knowledge.   | Prevent other academics from articulating their disposition.                    |
| Faculty and students the right to express views without fear of sanction unless it impairs the rights of others. | Protect from disciplinary action (although does guarantee “due process”).       |
| Right to draw conclusions on research that academics engage.   | Protect from penalties resulting from illegal activity.                         |
| That political, philosophical, and religious beliefs cannot be imposed on the academic.                          | Permit one to ignore policy or regulations (although does allow for criticism). |
| Right of redress if rights have been violated.   | Prevent disagreement with processes and practices.                              |
| Protection from reprisal for disagreeing with administrative policy.   | Protect the academic from various sanctions (such as denial of merit raises).   |
| Right to challenge alternative views (but not penalize those that hold them).                                    | Defend absenteeism of the subject matter (i.e., skipping class).                |
| The right to maintain academic standards.  | Guarantee an unqualified lifetime appointment.                                  |
| Substantial latitude in the teaching process.  | Shield from professional misconduct.  |
| For “due process.”   | Protect from investigations.  |

### 3. Current Campus Climate

The current campus climate is antithetical to the characteristics of an academically free culture. Braver [7] is critical of the current campus climate, questioning if free expression can even occur on college campuses today? Braver [7] describes current colleges campuses as places where 54% of students report not being able to articulate their beliefs without fear of reprisal.

Hillyer [8], similarly, describes the current climate on college campuses with some troubling statistics. Just over half of college students (51%) favor implementing speech codes which are designed to police or regulate what individuals are allowed to say on campus. Another 65% of students think that “trigger warnings” need to be provided when breaching controversial topics. And, Cole [9] reports that over two-thirds of college students (69%) support disciplinary measures against classmates

and faculty for engaging in discussions that “they deem offensive.”

Over one-third (38%) of students in college today report that they would not even consider being “friends” with someone in a differing political party [8]. Hillyer [8] further indicates that 53% of college students report that employing the use of physical violence is acceptable in suppressing alternative or opposing viewpoints.

Kaufmann [10] claims that faculty relations, similar to students, are also becoming strained on college campuses over social discourses and ideologies. For example, only a minimal 9% of faculty that identify as politically conservative report feeling “welcome” on their college campuses. McWhorter [11] describes a similar campus climate for faculty where an increasing number of external groups are demanding punitive measures on faculty that espouse different ideologies. Pressure from external groups are then leading to internal pressures where their academic freedoms should be recognized.

Former president of the University of Chicago, Dr. R. Zimmer, who inaugurated the Chicago Statement (an agreement for U.S. universities to uphold the tenets of academic freedom), is quoted, “discomfort is an intrinsic part of education [7].” Furedi [12] corroborates by stating that “controversy was once a fundamental aspect of academics.” Now, however, academic enrichment and intellectual development on college campuses is less of a priority than a person’s comfort [12]. Therefore, colleges and universities have determined that certain controversial topics are undesirable discourses, instead only discourses that that maintain a level of comfort is to be solicited.

### 4. Unwanted Discourses

Braver [7] criticizes that colleges have become an intolerant world where civil exchange of ideas has been replaced with political correctness. Certain topics are no longer wanted or encouraged on college campuses.

Colleges and Universities have determined that certain ideologies are inappropriate to express or discuss no matter how scholarly those topics may be considered. Frey and Stevens [2] summarized the topics that have most often cause encroachments on academic freedoms in the U.S. The top 20 most reported controversial discourses are 1) Race, 2) Institutional Policy, 3) Partisanship, 4) Gender, 5) Religion, 6) Sexuality, 7) Police/Military, 8) Israel/Palestine, 9) COVID-19, 10) Economic Status, 11) Terrorism, 12) Health/Health Care, 13) Free Speech, 14) Elections, 15) Foreign Affairs, 16) Current High Profile Public Trials, 17) Immigration, 18) Abortion, 19) Climate, and 20) Firearm Ownership/Second Amendment. Particularly interesting, is that “Free Speech” itself, tantamount to

academic freedoms, was a discourse that was often times considered unwanted.

Similar discourses are discouraged from being discussed on campuses in the U.K. [13]. Adekoya, Kaufmann, and Simpson [13] indicate that there is widespread support for actively discriminating against other academics based on their political beliefs. This discrimination occurs in the form of publishing, hiring, and promotion. One out of every four Social Science Professors studied by Adekoya et al. [13] supported investigations into their fellow scholars that engaged in controversial topics.

Unwanted topics are not only limited to what the academic does at work such as teach class, serve on committees, and/or conduct scholarship (i.e., presentations, grants, and publications); but, has also extended off-campus to include extramural engagement of discourses. In other words, academics are being policed over unwanted topics both within the university and from outside the university.

## 5. Socialization

An individual's training and socialization of what they perceive as illegitimate freedoms of others determines how individuals perceive offensive experiences [14]. Therefore, in order to suppress unwanted topics, colleges include such training and socialization for faculty and students into what they consider "shared" ideologies. This socialization process to suppress the unwanted topics takes many forms. This author will discuss some of the socialization tactics being employed to suppress unwanted topics.

### 5.1. Socialization of the Student

Students are socialized into homogenous ideologies through common college and university activities. For example, students at most colleges/universities begin their academic experience with an incoming student orientation. Depalma [15] described how incoming student orientation once prepared new college students to succeed academically in such areas as advising on curricular routes and instructing library usage into a socialization process that more recently includes controversial ideologies such as race relations, women's contraception, immigration, and censorship. Thus, socialized ideological conformity begins with new students visiting (sometimes for the first time) their college campuses. Gersen [14] underscores how this change has become problematic on current campuses by reporting that faculty and students are being threatened with disciplinary actions over engagements that offended certain individuals as discriminatory or harassing, while other individuals consider those same

engagements as simply controversial, provocative, or non-conformist.

Many colleges/universities are increasing non-faculty staff roles to manage student behavior. For example, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) offices have grown on campuses at a disproportional rate to the academic faculty with the mission of providing for the "well-being" of the student [16]. In fact, Virginia (VA) colleges showed an increase in non-academic staff whose primary responsibility it is to ensure adherence to DEI ideology. One public university in VA currently has 7.5 DEI staff members per every 100 academic faculty members [16]. And, Kannaby [17] reports that the largest public university in Ohio almost tripled its DEI budget from \$7.30 million to \$20.38 million while doubling DEI-specific staff in just five years. One purpose of these DEI staff is to socialize students into the college's chosen ideology supportive of DEI.

In the same regard, Will [18] indicates that colleges have increased their administration disproportionately to their faculty. Administrators grew 125% in the California Community College system while faculty only grew 24% and student body grew 33% over a ten-year time period. These administrators often have no responsibilities regarding academic development but rather manage student behavior [18]. This creates a culture where student's academic freedoms are governed by individuals who lack scholarly discourse themselves. Several colleges and universities have even gone so far as to create "bias response teams" that have been empowered to "police" the students' behavior on (and off) campus. These teams usually include the aforementioned non-academic staff. Bias response teams, it has been found [19], frequently do not include adequate "due process" for the student. Ironically, in the U.S. even biased speech is protected speech making these administrators' workload responsibilities questionable. Both Will [18] and Greene and Gonzalez [16] argue that increases in non-faculty are concerning due to the amount of non-academic staff now enabled to "police" discourses and ideology throughout the student body.

Throughout their college studies, students are often socialized in other ways. For example, during the recent COVID-19 pandemic, students were, at many schools, asked to sign a commitment to vaccinations or mask mandates, even if their personal or religious beliefs prohibited. Concurrently students are requested to signal their support for ideologies in various activities by signing promises/contracts.

In colleges of education seeking accreditation throughout the U.S.A., students are frequently measured on their "disposition" [20]. This also is a form of socializing students into an ideology. Colleges of education, it can be argued, have lost focus on developing critical teaching skills within their students and instead are coercing dispositional ideologies upon

students through “dispositional” adherence. The image that the student teacher needs to project a vaguely defined disposition to become a school teacher has been successfully socialized into the students [20].

Universities are commonly socializing students into social ideologies that they desire the students to have. *Lernfreiheit*, therefore, has been subverted for compliance with expressing similar ideologies of the administration.

## 5.2. Socialization of the Faculty

Faculty, similar to the students, are also socialized into homogenous ideologies. Faculty socialization can occur during new faculty orientation, faculty meetings, interviews, service committees, scholarly outlets, etc.

Majority of faculty begin their academic career through an application/interview process. In recent years many faculty members have been requested to indicate their commitment to social ideologies like DEI during the process. This process does not consider the applicants’ credentials, qualifications, merit, or expertise but rather the applicant’s adherence to an ideology. In fact, some critics like McWhorter [11] have argued that such applicant policies are a “litmus” test to determine ideological views. Adekoya, et al. [13] point to blatant discrimination by administrators during the hiring process if ideologies do not match the conformist view of the department/program. Known right-wing applicants, for instance, face an 80% chance of being discriminated against versus only 17% for a known centrist or 6% for a known leftist (note: results based on a four-person search committee). Likewise, Kauffman [10] reports that in the U.K., 45% of administrators would not hire a faculty member if their “Brexit” ideology differed, despite their academic expertise and qualifications.

Internally, Bradley et al. [21] explains that programs that do not comply with ideologies find themselves with reduced funding. Concurrently, some internal colleges attempt to coerce ideologies onto syllabi or course reviews ignoring that academic freedom includes the intellectual property of a course.

Outside of the university, academics are being socialized through scholarly committees. These can involve outside pressure from external organizations such as religious or politically affiliated organizations. Adekoya et al. [13] have noticed a disturbing trend of increasing number of scholarly review boards that are retracting scholarship for reasons other than academic misconduct (i.e., plagiarism, false data, etc.). This trend has escalated in publications, presentations, and grant application review boards. One recent high-profile retraction occurred during summer 2023 in which an academic publishing company retracted an article due to increasing pressure from external activists [22] despite

a growing number of disciplinary professionals who petitioned for inclusion of the publication. Wright [22] even goes so far as to describe the retraction of this high-profile article a “scientific scandal.” Increasingly, more academics are vulnerable to external political ideologies and their work and reputation suffer.

Likewise, Adekoya et al. [13] further discovered that the strongest levels of external discrimination faced by academics in the U.K. are from grant applications. Approximately half of grant reviewers would actively discriminate against a grant proposal if it took on a right-wing perspective as opposed to only about 20% that would discriminate against a grant proposal with a left-wing spin [13].

Academics visualize potential career consequences because they have not conformed to the established ideological norm. Faculty, thereby, are being socialized into homogenous ideologies both externally and internally. The response by majority of academics is to become silent on controversial discourses due to apprehension of career impacts. These faculty members have limited their own freedoms and become self-censors of their own discourses so as not to become targets of punitive measures.

## 6. Punitive Measures

When faculty and students fail to homogenize their ideologies or conform socially, they are often subjected to forms of punitive measures. Some of these punitive measures are censorship, demotion, mandatory training, suspension, resignation (usually after substantial harassment), investigation without due process, and termination.

### 6.1. Punitive Attempts

Frey and Stevens [2] have recorded and documented both the outcome and the attempts at sanctioning a scholar because being the target of sanction attempts has effects on the college/university climate. Most notably, the socialization process of an investigation (even if the scholar evades any punitive measures) signifies to other faculty that they are being monitored for expressing ideologies that are controversial to the college/university.

Over the last 23 years, Frey and Stevens [2] indicate that majority of sanction attempts have originated from within the college/university (967 total). A rising number of attempts have also occurred from outside the college or university (154 total) and been documented.

It was discovered that majority of punitive attempts originating from outside the college/university have been initiated by the political “right” or “conservative” based ideological groups and policy makers. Conversely, however, punitive attempts to sanction a

scholar occurring from within the college/university has originated, majority of the time, from students/other scholars/administrators that identify as being on the political “left” or “liberal” side of the political spectrum [2]. This author will discuss sanction attempts that originate from inside and outside the institution.

**6.1.1. Internal Origination of Sanctions.** Internal sanctions occur from four identified sources. College/University professors face threats to their academic freedoms from 1) Administrators, 2) Undergraduate Students, 3) Graduate Students, and 4) Other faculty members. This author has provided the number of internal sanction attempts per decade as reported by Frey and Stevens [2] in Table 2.

Table 2. Sanction Attempts Within Colleges

| <i>Initiator</i> | '00-09 | '10-19 | '00-22 | <i>total</i> |
|------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------------|
| Undergraduates   | 26     | 182    | 194    | 402          |
| Grad Students    | 0      | 39     | 50     | 89           |
| Other Scholars   | 13     | 65     | 99     | 177          |
| Administrators   | 56     | 138    | 105    | 299          |
| <i>Totals =</i>  | 95     | 424    | 448    | 967          |

The reader will note that majority of internal attempts to suppress an academics’ freedom originated from undergraduate students. Hillyer [8] corroborates this finding by reporting that over half (51%) of undergraduate students are in favor of instituting policies on free speech. In fact, it was reported that 53% of students thought that physical violence was an appropriate response in preventing expression of opposing views. Inversely, Honeycutt, Stevens, and Kaufmann [10] found that 93% of faculty thought that using violence to stop a campus speech was inappropriate. The implication in such findings is that students are more apt to rationalize using physical violence to suppress academic freedoms than administrators or fellow faculty members. A further implication is that faculty are more tolerant of their co-workers than students tend to be of faculty members. Such similarities are reflected in Frey and Stevens [2] study. While 38% of on-campus sanction attempts originated with undergraduate students (another 8% from graduate students), only 16% of internal sanction attempts were made by co-workers or other faculty members.

Most of the internal sanction attempts over the last 20 (+) years have originated with the undergraduate student body. This has substantially increased. In the most recent three years (2020–2022) the number of undergraduate sanction attempts is already greater than the undergraduate sanction attempts in the previous decade. Additionally, the number of sanction attempts originating from undergraduate students has

outnumbered, by about 25%, any other internal category.

Punitive attempts that originate from within the college/university are growing in each category; However, it is the alarmingly disproportional rate at which students are becoming increasingly intolerant of their university faculty that draws this authors attention.

**6.1.2. External Origination of Sanctions.** Not all threats to academic freedom occur from within the college/university. In fact, Frey and Stevens [2] have found that there is an increasing number of attempts to suppress academic freedoms coming from outside the college. Frey and Stevens [2] have indicated increasing attempts by both the General Public and Policy Makers/Political Groups. This author has provided that data in Table 3.

Table 3. Sanction Attempts Outside Colleges

| <i>Initiator</i> | '00-09 | '10-19 | '00-22 | <i>Total</i> |
|------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------------|
| General Public   | 6      | 46     | 25     | 77           |
| Policy Makers    | 4      | 34     | 39     | 77           |
| <i>Totals =</i>  | 10     | 80     | 64     | 154          |

External attempts at sanctioning faculty are classified into two categories. The first is sanction attempts by the general public and the second category is by policy makers (or elected/appointed government officials). A total of 10 documented sanction attempts occurred from external sources in the first decade (2000-2009). However, the second decade saw an increase by eight times (80 attempts). And, in the last three years (2020–2022) a total of 64 sanction attempts have already been tried from outside the colleges and universities.

Both the general public and political groups have increased their threats to academic freedoms over the last two decades. Frey and Stevens [2] point out that in the decade from 2000-2009 (the first decade of their study), the U.S. was actively engaged in two military conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq, a close and contentious federal election with multiple recounts (Nov., 2000) occurred, the most destructive terrorist attack in U.S. history happened on Sept. 11, 2001, etc. And yet, there were only ten recorded attempts to sanction academic scholars occurring from outside colleges and universities. Therefore, the increase in attempts from outside the universities to sanction faculty member have grown even though some of the more polarizing and contentious social ideologies existed in the first decade of the study.

## 6.2. Dismissal and the Ultimate Intolerance

Two-thirds of all sanction attempts over the last 23 years have resulted in a disciplinary sanction [2]. Perhaps, however, the most serious consequence imposed on a faculty member for not conforming to a set of social ideals is dismissal from the institution. Frey and Stevens [2] indicate in the scope of their report that approximately 21% of sanction attempts resulted in the termination of the faculty member due to this culture of ideological compliance.

The most provocative categories that concluded with faculty termination as a final outcome are listed in Table 4.

Table 4. Topics Leading to Faculty Termination

| <i>Topic</i>           | <i>Number of Dismissals</i> |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Institutional Policy   | 94                          |
| Race                   | 65                          |
| Gender                 | 43                          |
| Religion               | 36                          |
| Political Partisanship | 33                          |

The most dismissals occurred because a faculty member failed to conform their beliefs and expressions to institutional policies. Dismissal could be seen as an administrative solution for silencing their very own critics. Comments or expressions on race, gender, religion, and political parties have also led to removal of several faculty members. Such final consequence sends the adverse message that faculty members are not “free” to express themselves.

This author will highlight a few dismissals that have occurred over the last five years that, while antidotal in nature, underscore the tragedy that is ideological homogeneity.

Vanni [23] indicates that a faculty member was vilified, harassed, intimidated and eventually resigned from his position at a state-flagship university in Vermont due to expressing his discontent around institutional policy (the highest number of dismissals) on his personal social networking site. In this scenario, the faculty member’s freedom of external expression and right to criticize a public institution was encroached upon.

Glassner [24] provides another example of an academic that failed to comply with a social discourse and was terminated from his position in Texas. In this scenario, a Biology professor (who had taught at the college for over 20 years) was fired because some of his coursework offended a political ideological advocacy group. This political advocacy group pressured the school into the ultimate suppression of the academic’s freedoms.

Finally, an Art History professor was dismissed from a university in Minnesota because she discussed and

showed a piece of art in class that offended a student’s religious ideology [25]. The professor had provided documented warnings at the beginning of the semester, the week prior to the class, and beginning of that day’s lecture. After the president of the university terminated the professor, the majority of faculty banded together and demanded the resignation of the president due to her encroachments of the faculty’s academic’s freedoms. The faculty no longer had faith in their administration to honor commitments to academic freedom. This incident led to the cancellation of both the professor and the president. As a result of the professor cancellation, the faculty cancelled the university president.

Dismissal is not just a final outcome that faculty face for their reluctance to conform ideologically. Students also face dismissal from their failure to conform socially and/or ideologically thereby encroaching on their *lernfreiheit*. Young [26] provided information on a private university administration in VA that commonly expelled students if they espoused a political ideology that was different from that of the administration. Therefore, students have also suffered the ultimate penalty (dismissal) due to an administration that was intent on imposing political beliefs on the student body.

Both faculty and students have been dismissed or expelled due to exercising their academic freedoms. Dismissal or expulsion as a final punitive measure is a form of “excommunication” from groups who are intolerant of other’s ideological expressions and exercise of their freedoms. If colleges and universities are committed to academic freedoms, why then are they intolerant of individuals’ expressing their freedoms?

## 7. Discussion

Honeycutt, Stevens, and Kaufmann [27] indicate that during McCarthyism (late 1940’s throughout the 1950’s) in the U.S., colleges and universities were pressured by external policy makers to suppress controversial topics (especially relating to communist political ideologies). During this time faculty members (self) censored their academic freedoms because they were fearful from co-workers and students making accusations. It is reported by Honeycutt et al. [27] that during this stressful time in American academia, that 990 accusations of communist sympathy resulted in about half being disciplined and that 104 professors were fully terminated from their position due to these accusations of opposing ideology. This author notes that the total amount of sanction attempts and total number of dismissals/terminations reported from Frey and Stevens [2] study over the last 23 years exceeds that of the McCarthy era.

During McCarthyism in the 1950’s majority of suppression attempts came from external sources (i.e., policy makers, religious institutions, etc.). However, in

the current decade, majority of attempts to suppress academic freedoms are coming from within the college/university. From 2000 to 2014, only 78 attempts to sanction academics came from within the college/university. However, from 2015 to 2023 a total of 450 sanction attempts originated from within the college/university [2]. This author finds the growing trend of suppression attempts coming from inside the institution to be concerning especially when colleges and universities are usually places that champion academic freedoms.

While this author is located in the U.S., Adekoya et al. [13] report similar troubling trends in the U.K. For example, about 25% of social scientists in the U.K. would currently support a campaign to remove a colleague. Therefore, the issue of deteriorating academic freedoms is not isolated to just one place or country. Rather, this growing assault on academic freedoms and the attempt to suppress academics who do not espouse homogeneity to the preferred ideology is worldly.

## 8. Conclusion

This author concludes that there is an increasing encroachment on the academic freedoms of both students and faculty members. Such encroachments have been found in both the U.S. and the U.K. Despite the commitments made by earlier academic organizations in both the U.S. and the U.K., academia has regressed upon its once established foundation of academic freedom. Increasing attempts to suppress scholars have occurred both from within the college/university and from outside the college/university. There have been rising attempts from both sides of the political spectrum to suppress academic freedoms. Increases in attempts to suppress a scholar's freedoms have occurred from students (graduate and undergraduate), administrators, fellow faculty, and externally through organizations and individuals. The implications are that there are fewer groups and individuals that value academic freedom. And, colleges have become intolerant of alternative ideologies.

Academic freedom is in fact an ideology. Therefore, "academic freedom" is sometimes an unwanted topic, itself, on college/university campuses. This author subscribes to an ideology of academic freedom and provides the reader with a thought-provoking 1989 quote from former U.S. Supreme Court Justice William Brennan:

*If there is a bedrock principle underlying the first amendment, it is that the government may not prohibit the expression of an idea simply because society finds the idea itself offensive or disagreeable.*

This author leaves the reader with the final question: Why, then, are there increasing active socialization efforts on college/university campuses to suppress ideas when those very institutions claim to support academic freedoms?

## 9. References

- [1] Holt, B. J. (2020). 'Identifying and Preventing Threats to Academic Freedom', *International Journal for Infonomics*, 13(2), pp. 2005-2012.
- [2] Frey, K. & Stevens, S. T. (2023). 'Scholars Under Fire: Attempts to Sanction Scholars From 2000 -2022', *The Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression*; <https://www.thefire.org/research-learn/scholars-under-fire-attempts-sanctionscholars-2000-2022> (Access Date: 1 October, 2023).
- [3] Commager, H. S. (1963). 'The University and Freedom: *Lehrfreiheit & Lernfreiheit*', *The Journal of Higher Education* 34(7), pp. 361-370.
- [4] Dea, S. (2018). 'A Brief History of Academic Freedom', *University Affairs*; <https://www.universityaffairs.ca/opinion/dispatches-academic-freedom/a-brief-history-of-academic-freedom/> (Access Date: 9 October, 2018).
- [5] Ludlum, R. P. (1950). 'Academic Freedom and Tenure: A History', *The Antioch Review*, 10(1), pp. 3-34.
- [6] Nelson, C. (2010). 'Defining Academic Freedom', *Inside Higher Education*; <https://insidehighered.com/views/2010/12/21/defining-academic-freedom> (Access Date: December, 2010).
- [7] Braver, R. (2018). 'A War of Words on College Campuses', *CBS News*; <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/a-war-of-words-on-college-campuses/> (Access Date: 21 January, 2018).
- [8] Hillyer, Q. (2023). 'At Colleges, Logic and Free Speech Both are in Short Supply', *Washington Examiner*; <https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/restoring-america/equality-not-elitism-/at-colleges-logic-and-free-speech-both-are-in-short-supply> (Access Date: 25 September, 2023).
- [9] Cole, J. P. (2016). 'The Chilling Effect of Fear at America's Colleges', *The Atlantic*; <https://theatlantic.com/education/archive/2016/06/the-chilling-effect-of-fear/486338/> (Access Date: 9 June, 2016).
- [10] Kaufmann, E. (2021). 'Academic Freedom is Withering', *Wall Street Journal*; <https://wsj.com/articles/academic-freedom-is-withering> (Access Date: 28 February, 2021).
- [11] McWhorter, J. (2020). 'Academics are Really, Really, Worried About Their Freedoms', *The Atlantic*; <https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2020/09/academic-s-are-really-worried-about-their-freedom/615724/> (Access Date: 1 September, 2020).

- [12] Furedi, F. (2018). 'The Campus Culture of Fear and Its Costs', *City Journal*; <https://www.city-journal.org/html/campus-culture-fear-and-its-costs-16095.html> (Access Date: 3 August, 2018).
- [13] Adekoya, R., Kaufmann, E., & Simmpson, T. (2020). 'Academic Freedom in the UK: Protecting Viewpoint Diversity', *Policy Exchange*; <https://policyexchange.org.uk/publication/academic-freedom--in-the-uk-2/> (Access Date: 3 August, 2020).
- [14] Gersen, J. S. (2022). "Academic Freedom and Discrimination in a Polarizing Time", *Houston Law Review*; <https://houstonlawreview.org/article/35599/academic-freedom-and-discrimination-in-a-polarizing-time> (Access Date: 10 May, 2022).
- [15] Depalma, A. (1991, August 28). 'As Life Changes, So Does Freshman Orientation', *The New York Times*; pg. B19.
- [16] Greene, J. & Gonzalez. M. (2023). 'The Dangerous DEI Bloat at Virginia's Public Universities', *The Heritage Foundation*; <https://www.heritage.org/education/report/the-dangerous-dei-bloat-virginias-public-universities> (Access Date: 21 September, 2023).
- [17] Kabbanny, J. (2023). 'Ohio State University doubled DEI staff in five years, payroll costs almost tripled', *The College Fix*; <https://www.thecollegefix.com/ohio-state-university-doubled-dei-staff-in-five-years-payroll-costs-almost-tripled/> (Access Date: 3 November, 2023).
- [18] Will, G. (2018). 'Trigger Warning: An Embarrassing Fragility on College Campuses', *Washington Post*; <https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/the-cult-of-fragility-on-college-campuses/2018/09/12/1368b146-b5e7-11e8-a2c5-3187> (Access Date: 12 September, 2018).
- [19] Miller, R. (2018). 'Free Speech Tensions: Respopnding to Bias on College and University Campuses', *NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education*; <https://www.naspa.org/blog/free-speech-tensions-responding-to-bias-on-college-and-university-campuses1> (Access Date: 17 April, 2018).
- [20] Eaton, J. S. (2010). 'Accreditation and the Federal Future of Higher Education', *American Association of University Professors*; <https://www.aaup.org/article/accreditation-and-federal-future-higher-education> (Access Date: September/ October, 2010).
- [21] Bradley, G., Brown, G., & Ufot, N. (2011). 'Crisis in Public Higher Education', *American Association of University Professors*; <https://www.aaup.org/article/crisis-public-higher-education> (Access Date: May/June, 2011).
- [22] Wright, C. (2023). 'Anatomy of a Scientific Scandal', *City Journal*; <https://www.city-journal.org/article/anatomy-of-a-scientific-scandal> (Access Date: 12 June, 2023).
- [23] Vanni, K. (2021). 'Students Call for Professor to Resign Over His Video Claiming White Discrimination', *The Vermont Cynic*; <https://vtcynic.com/news/students-call-for-professor-to-resign-over-his-video-claiming-white-discrimination/> (Access Date: 15 March, 2021).
- [24] Glassner, D. (2023). 'Texas Professor Fired After Teaching Sex is Determined by Chromosomes: Legal group', *The College Fix*; <https://www.thecollegefix.com/texas-professor-fired-after-teaching-sex-is-determined-by-chromosomes-legal-group/> (Access Date: 4 July, 2023).
- [25] Jaschik, S. (2023). 'Hamline Faculty Calls on President to Step Down', *Inside Higher Education*; <https://www.insidehighered.com/quicktakes/2023/01/26/hamline-faculty-calls-president-step-down> (Access Date: 25 January, 2023).
- [26] Young, W. (2019). 'Inside Liberty University's Culture of Fear', *Washington Post*; <https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2019/07/24/inside-liberty-universitys-culture-fear-how-jerry-falwell-jr-silences-students-professors-who-reject-his-pro-trump-politics/?arc404=true> (Access Date: 24 July, 2019).
- [27] Honeycutt, N., Stevens, S. T., and Kaufmann, E. (2023). 'What Faculty Think About Free Expression and Academic Freedom on Campus' *Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression*; <https://www.thefire.org/research-learn/academic-mind-2022-what-faculty-think-about-free-expression-and-academic-freedom> (Access Date: 15 July, 2023).