

May 20, 2007

Dear Prof. Crosby and members of the Senate Executive Committee:

As representatives of the faculty group Scholars for Peace in the Middle East, we met with Senate Chair Crosby and CEP Chair Jaye Padgett on May 4th to discuss what we believe is a widespread and serious problem affecting several academic programs in the Social Sciences and Humanities at UCSC. We are concerned that in these divisions a rampant politicization is leading to the corruption of the academic mission of our University.

Of particular concern to our faculty group are the anti-Israel and anti-Zionist bias and political advocacy found in classrooms and at departmentally-sponsored events. Please consider the following representative examples:

- A Community Studies class on “The Israeli-Palestinian Conflict” had a clear anti-Israel bias in its content and readings, and the instructor encouraged students via the class website to engage in anti-Israel activities. (See **Appendix 1** for student testimony and documentation from website).
- The professor of a Community Studies class on women’s health activism invited into the class a guest lecturer who gave a slide presentation and discussed the brutal and ruthless way Israeli soldiers treat Palestinians. The presentation, which ran for a full class period, seemed to have no thematic connection to the course. (See **Appendix 2** for student testimony).
- The professor of an Introduction to Sociology class invited into the class a guest lecturer from the Palestine Children’s Relief Fund, who spoke and showed video clips about how Israeli soldiers prevent Palestinian children from receiving life-saving medical treatment. The presentation seemed to have no thematic connection to the course. (See **Appendix 3** for student testimony).
- Since 2001, several events dealing with the Israeli-Palestinian conflict sponsored by the departments of Politics, Community Studies, Feminist (Women’s) Studies, Sociology, History and Anthropology, as well as the Center for Global and International Research Studies, the Center for Justice, Community and Tolerance, Cultural Studies and the Institute for Humanities Research, have been biased against Israel. Moreover, during the same time period, none of these departments or research groups sponsored events dealing with the Israeli-Palestinian conflict which did *not* have an anti-Israel bias. (See **Appendix 4** for a list of events and departmental sponsors, and **Appendix 5** for a report on the most recent

event, an unambiguously anti-Zionist and anti-Israel conference sponsored by 8 UCSC departments and research groups).

The politicization of academic programs is not limited to anti-Israel and anti-Zionist bias and political advocacy. Consider, for example, the following:

- On April 23, 2006, 13 UCSC departments and research groups sponsored a teach-in against the war or terror. While advertised widely as educational, this event was unambiguously politically motivated and directed, and encouraged anti-war activism. (See **Appendix 6** for letter written to the Committee on Academic Freedom about the event).
- On March 9, 2007, 14 UCSC departments and research groups sponsored an event entitled “What’s Your Freedom Dream? A Forum for Student Activism in the Post-Civil Rights Era”. A poster advertising the event announced that the speaker would present a “vision of a world united front against racism and empire – and offer concrete actions that students, faculty and workers can take with them”.
- On May 23, 2007, two events with speaker Medea Benjamin are being co-sponsored by the Feminist Studies Department. A lunch-time program for students advertises that the event will encourage them to “engage and network with fellow students in the activist community to discuss strategies strengthening and expanding the anti-war movement”. The evening event is also advertised as encouraging political activism, with the promise that attendees will “learn the ways to get involved in the global peace movement and how we can STOP THE NEXT WAR NOW!!”

In conclusion, we believe that political bias and advocacy injected into classrooms and departmentally-sponsored events lead to a corruption of the academic mission of the University and violate the norms of academic integrity and competence in the following ways:

- 1) Education has become indoctrination
- 2) Political goals and personal partisan interests have taken precedence over the standards of truth, accuracy and scholarship
- 3) Scholarly debate, the expression of differing opinions and the dissemination of important information and knowledge have been suppressed

While we appreciate the vital importance of academic freedom to the University, we are aware that the guarantee of the professoriate’s freedom of research, teaching and publication is only one part of that freedom. The other part, no less vitally important, is the exercise of the proper self-regulation necessary for ensuring compliance with professional norms. Indeed, when Robert Post spoke at UCSC recently, he underscored the fact that the ideal of academic freedom has *never* been construed as an individual right, but rather as the right of the profession to "the unimpeded application of

professional norms of inquiry". We therefore believe it is up to the Academic Senate, as the faculty body invested with the responsibility for ensuring the application of these professional norms of inquiry, to examine the extent to which political bias and advocacy in classrooms and at departmentally-sponsored events meet with the standards of academic integrity and scholarly competence befitting our University.

At our meeting earlier this month, Chair Crosby suggested that an Academic Senate task force be established to look into our concerns. We feel that this is an excellent idea, and we would be happy to help in any way we can.

Thank you for your consideration,

Ilan Benjamin
Professor of Chemistry, UCSC
Head of UCSC Scholars for Peace in the Middle East

Tammi Rossman-Benjamin
Lecturer in Hebrew, UCSC
Member of UCSC Scholars for Peace in the Middle East

Appendix 1

Anti-Israel bias and political advocacy in “The Israeli-Palestinian Conflict”, a course taught in summer 2006 in the Community Studies department at UCSC

1) Student testimony

My last class at UC Santa Cruz was a Community Studies (CMMU 120) course on the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict. What I thought would be an interesting and informative course exploring the two sides of a very complex conflict, turned out to be so outrageously one-sided and anti-Israel as to make a mockery of the educational system. The professor used her lectures, classroom discussions and course readings as a vehicle for her own personal vendetta against the state of Israel, against Zionism, against Israelis and against Jews. She even used the class website to distribute information about anti-Israel protests occurring in the Bay Area and to invite her students to attend. Many times when I would confront the professor in class or on WebCT, she would argue with me so harshly that I felt personally assaulted by her. This class went against everything that the academic world should stand for. It was not about the presentation of diverse ideas so that students can use the valuable information they learn to construct their own opinions. Students were fed lies, twisted truths and one sided information- all presented as facts.

2) Instructor's web posting to students

Author: Lecturer XXXXX

Date: Friday, July 14, 2006 10:43am

PLEASE CIRCULATE WIDELY.

Join us for a rally.

MONDAY JULY 17, 2006, AT NOON

ISRAELI CONSULATE, 456 MONTGOMERY STREET, SAN FRANCISCO

A CALL BY BAY AREA JEWS: Break the Siege on Gaza! No War on Lebanon

BEFORE OUR EYES, the people of Gaza are being brutally and collectively punished by Israel. Israel is using a single captured Israeli soldier as a pawn to employ its enormous military might and terrorize an entire people. With the bombing of civilian targets in Lebanon, Israel threatens to escalate the current crisis into a regional war, with potentially devastating consequences for people throughout the region.

The humanitarian situation in Gaza, already dire from 39 years of occupation, and a

recent Israeli blockade of basic supplies, is now desperate. Israel's bombing of power stations and bridges and cutting off fuel supplies in Gaza deprives people of electricity, refrigeration, pumped drinking water, and sewage disposal. The relentless and deadly attacks by the Israeli military are compounded by the threat of epidemics and starvation.

Presenting this as an isolated hostage-taking incident ignores Israel's regular abduction of Palestinians from their homes. Israel holds over 9,000 Palestinians in prison, including almost 400 children. Thousands of these prisoners are held in "administrative detention" without charges or trial. They too need to be returned to their families.

With the recent arrest of 64 members of the Palestinian Parliament and many members of the Palestinian cabinet, Israel is also using this opportunity to wage an assault on Palestinian democracy. All of this is being done with diplomatic support and \$3 billion in tax-funded annual aid to Israel from the U.S. government.

As Jews, we cannot and will not remain observers of crimes committed in our name. We call on other Jews and all people who believe in justice and peace to take a principled stand against this brutality.

Here's what you can do.

SUPPORT ISRAELIS protesting against their government's destructive actions: Gush Shalom (zope.gush-shalom.org), Israeli Committee Against House Demolitions (www.ICAHD.org <<http://www.icahd.org/>>), New Profile (www.newprofile.org <<http://www.newprofile.org/>>).

WRITE TO YOUR REPRESENTATIVES to demand that the US government stop funding Israel's war crimes and act to achieve an immediate ceasefire.

MAKE YOUR VOICES HEARD! JOIN WITH US TO PROTEST THE SIEGE OF GAZA--

Organized by: Break the Silence, Jewish Voice for Peace, Jews for a Free Palestine

STOP THE US/ISRAEL ATTACKS ON GAZA NOW! NO WAR ON LEBANON

Appendix 2

Student testimony regarding anti-Israel bias in a UCSC Community Studies class

I am a third year student at the University of California Santa Cruz. I am currently a community studies and anthropology major. I was fulfilling my last upper division community studies class by taking a woman's health activism class with Professor XXXX. I was very excited to take the class to learn about different ways in which I could make my voice heard in the community as a woman and an activist.

Each week a different speaker would come and speak to us about topics which we had read about: violence against women, fat activism, transgender issues, and many other things. One week I came into class to find my professor not present and the teacher assistants introducing our speaker for the week as a woman that would speak to us about occupation in Palestine. As a Jewish and an Israeli student I was very curious to hear what she was going to speak about and how it related to our class. Apparently she was an artist that works with the group "Breaking the Silence" and paints murals and art in the occupied territories for the people there. I thought, wow what an interesting thing to do; this was until she began showing her slide show. All of the slides that were shown were of Palestinian people blind-folded and made to sit in corners while armed Israeli soldiers stood behind them smiling. Along with these disturbing photos she continued to show a video of Israeli soldiers that came into a Palestinian community and were beating and cutting down their olive trees. When asked by a student how this topic related to our class, the speaker replied that she didn't know and that the professor had simply told her to come. She didn't even know what subject was being taught in our class. She was supposed to demonstrate the use of art as a form of healing, but her presentation showed none of this and was extremely saturated with her political views.

By the end of the lecture I was feeling uncomfortable, outraged, and upset. I raised my hand and asked a question. "So I see that you went to the occupied territories and produced art with them to have an outlet for their anger towards the occupation, but have you ever been to Israel and made murals and art projects with the people there and heard the stories of people affected by the violence there?" I was answered by a resounding NO. After that I raised my hand again to ask another question and she looked at me and told me she wanted to give other people who have not spoken a chance to speak. I looked around and no one else had their hand up. She continued to bombard us with statistics of Palestinian people that were killed. Many of her charts and numbers were very weighted towards the Palestinian people; more Palestinian people were killed than Israelis. All the information, photos, and videos were given to us with no background information or historical time periods. It all had no context in which the students could challenge the information. We were just shown pictures of humiliated Palestinians and dangerous border crossings.

Being a student in a fairly liberal university I was surprised that no one in my class questioned her information or said that her information seemed very one sided, other than me. Her defense of not showing both sides was that she said that the Palestinian people are not represented in the media and most people knew about the conflict from the Israeli point of view. The fact that no students questioned her information goes to show how little most students actually know about the topics. In fact, when we were asked to critique the speaker afterwards, most students reacted positively to her talk. It scares me that most students are uneducated on this topic, and they walk away given only one side and are ok about it; the students don't know any better.

I'm not a complete pro-Israel person, so if the speaker came and gave a talk about the violence and oppression happening only to the Israeli people I would still protest that it was one-sided. I feel that if the topic is going to be presented within an academic atmosphere, it needs to be represented and presented equally, in order to allow the students to formulate their own opinions and ideas about the topic. There are too many people that are not educated about the struggle in Israel and will take whatever information that they are given as the entire truth.

Appendix 3

Student testimony regarding anti-Israel bias in a UCSC Sociology class

I entered an Introduction to Sociology (SOC 1) lecture this week and was surprised to have a guest lecturer from the Palestine Children's Relief Fund (PCRF). While I feel that it is an unfortunate situation for the children to be in, whether they are Israeli or Palestinian, this organization was completely anti-Israel, and also in many ways anti-Semitic. During the lecture, he showed video clips of IDF soldiers turning away seemingly sick children from border crossings. The video clips were spliced together, and focused very much on the Jewish nature of the soldiers. The lecturer went on to discuss how Israel's policies killed millions of Palestinians and was forcing them to resort to violence. I am still unsure as to how this entire lecture relates to sociology in any way; I do, however, feel that this organization, and perhaps the professor, is using the children to push a Palestinian agenda. I see posters around campus for Palestinian events, and even though I do not agree with them, I fully support their presence. I do not, however, support my money being spent on a pro-Palestinian lecturer when I am supposed to be learning about Sociology. After doing some background research...some internet sources have reported that the group's founder has lectured multiple times at universities quoting classic anti-Semitic propaganda.

While this entire situation upsets me very much, my main problem with the lecture was that it was very one-sided. Nowhere in the syllabus is the professor inviting an Israeli aid-worker to talk about health care in Israel.

Appendix 4

Anti-Israel biased events sponsored by several departments at UCSC Fall 2001 – Winter 2007

- 5/12/01** - Video: *"Two Palestinian Women Political Prisoners" (1999)*
Photo Exhibit: *Palestinian Women Refugees in Lebanon and Palestine*

From the *"Women of Color Film & Video Festival"*, sponsored by: Art History; Center for Cultural Studies; Center for Global, International, and Regional Studies; Center for Justice, Tolerance and Community; Chicano/Latino Research Center; Community Studies; Film and DigitalMedia History of Consciousness; Institute of Humanities Research; Latin American and Latino Studies; Literature; Politics and Legal Studies; Sociology; Women's Studies.

- 1/28/02** – *"Israel and Palestine: The Search for Justice and Security"*, a talk by Joel Beinin

Sponsored by: Cultural Studies

- 5/24/02** - *"Exposing the Conflict: On the Road to Peace, A Panel Discussion on the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict"*

Sponsored by: Center for Justice, Tolerance and Community, Center for Global, International and Regional Studies, Sociology

- 1/30/03** – *Israeli Palestinian Conflict Video and Dialogue Night: "Crossing the Lines"*

Sponsored by the Center for Global, International and Regional Studies

- 3/4/03** – *"NO PRIDE IN THE OCCUPATION"* -- Talk & video clips, Dalit Baum

Sponsored by Community Studies, GLBT Resource Center, Center for Justice Tolerance & Community & Women's Studies.

- 5/22/03** – *"Palestine and Iraq: A New Century of Imperialism in the Middle East"*, a talk by Richard Falk

Sponsored by the Center for Global, International and Regional Studies, Center for Justice, Tolerance and Community, Politics, Sociology, Community Studies

- 2/5/04** - *"Holy Land: Common Ground"*, Alicia Dwyer Filmmaker and

Documentarian

Sponsored by the Center for Global, International and Regional Studies

10/21/04 - A Talk on the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict by Hedy Epstein, member of the International Solidarity Movement

Sponsored by Women's Studies

4/27/05 - Feminisms and Global War Seminar: "Up against the Wall - Making the Concrete Bloom in Israel/ Palestine", Dalit Baum

Sponsored by Feminist Studies

5/25/05 - Bereaved Families

Sponsored by Center for Global, International and Regional Studies, Center for Justice, Tolerance and Community

10/9/06 – “*Space, Time, and Violence in the Palestinian Occupied Territories*”, Adi Ophir

Sponsored by: Cultural Studies

10/25/06 - “*Breaking the Silence: ex-Israeli soldiers expose their crimes against Palestinians in the Occupied Territories*”

Sponsored by Cultural Studies, Center for Global, International and Regional Studies and the Politics department

3/15/07 - Conference: “*Alternative Histories Within and Beyond Zionism*”

Sponsored by Institute for Humanities Research, College 9/10, Feminist Studies, Anthropology, CGIRS, Community Studies, Sociology, Politics, and History

Appendix 5

Report on “Alternative Histories Within and Beyond Zionism” conference at UCSC on March 15, 2007

Submitted by Tammi Rossman-Benjamin and Ilan Benjamin

Approximately 100 people attended the conference -- about 70 students, 20 faculty members and 10 community members. UCSC Anthropology professor Lisa Rofel, the conference organizer and moderator, opened the event by saying that the conference was an historic one at UCSC, and represented the “highest ideals of academic freedom”.

The first speaker was David Theo Goldberg, Director of the University of California Humanities Research Institute, who spoke on “Racial Palestinianization”. Goldberg claimed that Israel was, from its inception, a racist entity, which used its racist state policies to protect the purity of the Jewish race and exclude and oppress the Palestinians. In his talk and accompanying slide presentation, Goldberg explicitly and implicitly linked Israel’s current state policies and practices to those of the Nazis. Goldberg concluded his talk by asserting that Israel’s oppression of the Palestinians was part of a race war begun by Israel in order to rid the land of a despised racial group, and that within such a context, suicide bombing was an understandable and even fair response.

Judith Butler, a professor in the departments of Rhetoric and Comparative Literature at UC Berkeley, was the second speaker. Her talk was entitled “Hidden Histories of Post-Zionism”. Basing herself in part on the writings of Edward Said and in part on those of Jewish thinkers in the first half of the 20th century such as Martin Buber and Hannah Arendt, Butler claimed that Zionism was a racist and therefore illegitimate ideology, and she argued for the creation of a secular democratic bi-national state, which would replace the Jewish State. While Butler complained that the debate about a bi-national state is often stifled with the argument that it will lead to the destruction of Israel, she did not address the issue of why this concern is unfounded, or how Jews would be able to live safely and securely in a state with a Muslim majority.

The third speaker was Hilton Obenzinger, Associate Director for Honors and Advanced Writing at the Stanford Writing Center. His talk, entitled “Jewish Opposition to the Occupation Since 1967, A Personal and Public Journey“, was indeed primarily a personal account of how, after growing up in a Zionist Jewish home, Obenzinger became an anti-Zionist activist who opposed the Jewish State and advocated Palestinian causes. Obenzinger also described and decried the opposition within the Jewish community to his anti-Israel pro-Palestinian efforts.

Terri Ginsberg, an adjunct professor at Purchase College, was the fourth speaker. In her talk, “Holocaust Film and Zionism: Exposing a Collaboration”, Ginsburg drew heavily upon the writings of Norman Finkelstein in claiming that Holocaust films have facilitated and justified the propagation of a racist Zionist ideology, which has resulted in the oppression, ethnic cleansing and genocide of the Palestinians. She noted that her ideas were very unpopular both in the academy and in the Jewish community, and she accused those who would discredit her work of being “McCarthyites”.

The fifth and final speaker was Ryvka Bar Zohar, a graduate student at NYU, whose talk was entitled “A History of Zionism and the Politics of Divestment”. Bar Zohar presented her own ideas about the history of Zionism, arguing that the ideology grew out of the attempt of Eastern European Jews to recover from the “shame” of the Diaspora and the Holocaust by finding pride in domination. According to her analysis, Zionism was an essentially racist doctrine, which led to the creation of an apartheid state. Bar Zohar used her analysis to argue that the movement to divest from Israel was a justified and effective strategy for mounting an opposition to Zionism for all anti-Zionist and anti-apartheid activists.

It wasn't until after the final speaker had concluded, with less than a half-hour remaining to the 3-and-a-half hours scheduled for the conference, that the moderator opened the floor for questions. Unfortunately, by that time most of the audience had left the hall, as well as one of the speakers. At the end of the event, a student approached one of the members of the audience who had, during the question and answer period, challenged the use of the term ‘Arab Jews’ by one of the speakers, and she yelled at him several times, “You are a racist”. Another student approached two men engaged in a private conversation about how egregiously biased the conference was, and she said in a clear and accusatory tone, “You have blood on your hands”.

The few pro-Israel students in the room were extremely upset after the event. One student was appalled that her own department, History, had sponsored this event. Another expressed outrage that her university tuition was supporting what she felt was anti-Israel propaganda.

There are four aspects of this conference that should deeply concern all university administrators and faculty, as well as members of the tax-paying public:

- 1) Although promoted as an academic event and sponsored by 8 UCSC departments and research groups (Institute for Humanities Research, Feminist Studies, Anthropology, CGIRS, Community Studies, Sociology, Politics and History), this conference did not adhere to even minimal standards of scholarship. First of all, neither the conference organizer nor any of the speakers is a recognized scholar of the history of Zionism or Israel, and collectively they boast few academic publications in this area. Secondly, only two of the five speakers referenced the scholarship of others. Of these, Ginsburg based much of her work on the highly questionable scholarship of Norman Finkelstein, and Butler's interpretation of one of her key sources was disputed by the book's editor, who happened to be in the audience at the time. Thirdly, the use of demonizing and vilifying language and slides in Goldberg's talk, the focus on personal anecdotes in Obenzinger's talk, and the justification of political activism that was at the heart of Bar Zohar's talk, all raise a number of serious questions about the academic quality of this event.
- 2) Far from representing a diversity of legitimate scholarly perspectives on the topic of Zionism, the speakers all articulated the same extremist view about Israel's founding ideology, namely, that it was racist and illegitimate, and called into question the legitimacy of the Jewish State itself. Indeed, this uniformity of

perspective and expression of egregious anti-Israel bias, which violate the norms of academic integrity, are not surprising, given that all five speakers identified themselves in the course of their talks as anti-Zionists, and two of them, Obenzinger and Ginsberg, openly expressed their solidarity with the Palestinian people. It seems, however, that such a one-sided anti-Israel conference is just what the conference organizer, Lisa Rofel, had in mind. For when Jewish Studies director Murray Baumgarten offered to work with Rofel to create a more balanced event by bringing speakers with other legitimate scholarly perspectives about Zionism and Israel, she declined the offer.

- 3) It is clear that the conference was an event dominated by political advocacy. Most of the speakers were explicit about their political motivation and advocacy efforts: The talks by Obenzinger and Bar Zohar were wholly devoted to justifying and promoting their anti-Israel political efforts. Butler introduced her talk by saying that she had committed herself “to speaking out, and to encouraging other Jews to speak out”, and Ginsberg said that her goal was “to transform Zionism in the name of social justice”. Moreover, the anti-Israel political stands of the speakers must have been well-known to the conference organizer, as all of them had previously spoken out publicly against the Jewish State, either by signing divestment petitions and other public statements calling for halting all aid to Israel, boycotting Israeli academics, or organizing "Israeli Apartheid Week" events. Indeed, the conference organizer herself is a signatory the petition urging that the University of California divest from Israel.
- 4) The US Department of State, in its working definition of anti-Semitism, has included the following examples of the manifestation of anti-Semitism in public discourse:
 - Denying the Jewish people their right to self-determination (e.g., by claiming that the existence of a State of Israel is a racist endeavor).
 - Applying double standards by requiring of Israel a behavior not expected or demanded of any other democratic nation.
 - Drawing comparisons of contemporary Israeli policy to that of the Nazis.
 - Accusing the Jews as a people, or Israel as a state, of inventing or exaggerating the Holocaust.

The description of the talks above suggests that every one of these examples found expression at this conference. In addition, it is reasonable to assume that the speakers' blatant anti-Israel bias and inflammatory rhetoric gave rise to the hostile behavior of some students in the audience towards the few people who openly expressed disagreement with the speakers.

Appendix 6

Letter to members of the UCSC Committee on Academic Freedom from Tammi Rossman-Benjamin, who was serving on the committee at the time as a non-senate member

April 30, 2006

Dear Bettina and fellow CAF members,

I would like to share with you some concerns I have regarding the recent teach-in on "The War Against Terror", presented by Faculty Against the War.

Of course UC faculty have the right, guaranteed by both the UC academic freedom rules and the US Constitution, to speak their minds, create like-minded faculty groups and even organize and promote events on campus that express their particular perspectives. None of this is objectionable. What is objectionable, however, and, I would argue, an abuse of both academic freedom and free speech, is when official university monies, resources and offices are used in support of one-sided events that are politically motivated and politically directed.

Such was the case with the recent teach-in, whose organizers were very clear that the event was to be an exercise in political advocacy. To that end, the talks and entertainment presented were consistently and unabashedly anti-Republican and anti-conservative, and most of the talks encouraged political action as a means of achieving specific political goals. Moreover, several of the speakers lionized the behavior of members of Students Against War, who, two weeks previously, had forced military recruiters off the campus, in violation of the Solomon Amendment linking a university's federal funding to the access it provides to military recruiters.

I want to reiterate that I do not wish to challenge the right of faculty (or students) to publicly express their views on campus. My concern is rather with the fact that this one-sided, political event was given major funding and academic legitimacy by the offices of the Chancellor and Executive Vice Chancellor, five colleges, nine departments and four research units.

Both the draft on "Academic Freedom: Its Privilege and Responsibility Within the University of California" and AAC&U's statement on "Academic Freedom and Educational Responsibility", which we read in preparation for our last committee meeting, end with admonitions about the dangers of ignoring the responsibilities that are included in the professorate's exercise of academic freedom. In this regard, I believe the faculty who organized the recent teach-in and those faculty and administrative units who supported them acted irresponsibly and in such a way as to endanger the privilege of academic freedom rather than promote it, for the following reasons:

- 1) It is unethical and arguably illegal for a public university (or indeed any non-profit

corporation) to use institutional funds for the promotion of a political agenda.

2) By praising rather than admonishing the students who forced military recruiters off the campus on April 11, faculty and administrators run the risk of losing approximately \$80 million dollars a year which UCSC receives in federal funding, much of it to support research in the sciences that could otherwise not be carried out. Thus, a violation of the Solomon Amendment could effectively take away the academic freedom of UCSC scientists to engage in their research. (Perhaps this is why no departments in the Physical and Biological Sciences division or the School of Engineering provided funding for the teach-in).

3) The legitimization of the teach-in by so many academic units serves to blur the distinction between bona fide scholarship, which lies at the heart of the university's mission, and political indoctrination, which is anathema to that mission. One of the deleterious consequences of this which affects all of the university's faculty -- even those who did not support the teach-in -- is that UCSC's reputation for scholarship and academic integrity becomes tarnished.

4) The one-sided, highly political nature of the teach-in, legitimized as it was by many academic and administrative units, created a hostile environment for those in the campus community who do not share the political perspective of the organizers. For example, many of the College Republicans felt discriminated against on the day of the teach-in, as much of the content of the event had an explicitly anti-Republican bias. Moreover, when one narrow political perspective is presented and afforded academic legitimacy, at the expense of all others, it becomes quite difficult, if not impossible, for individuals with dissenting perspectives to exercise their academic freedom. This is, in fact, the primary issue which the Morrow Bill seeks to address.

I believe the recent teach-in is but one example of the way in which the institutionally-funded and academically-legitimized politicization of our campus has served to endanger academic freedom, and that it is incumbent upon us to address this issue before government interference becomes a threat to faculty independence and autonomy.

Could this issue be put on the agenda of our next CAF meeting?

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Tammi