May 17, 2005

Dear SAR friends,

Thank you!

The 2005 Scholars at Risk Meeting and Global Strategies for Defending Academic Freedom conference took place on April 28-29, 2005 at New York University. More than 80 faculty, administrators, human rights advocates, higher education experts and guests participated, including scholars from Belarus, Iran, Liberia, Pakistan, Rwanda, Ukraine, Venezuela and Zimbabwe. Thank you to everyone who made the events such a great success!

A special thanks to our co-sponsor, the Institute of International Education’s Scholar Rescue Fund. Thanks also to the Open Society Institute and New York University’s Office of the Provost, Graduate School of Arts & Science and the Center for Human Rights & Global Justice.

This report summarizes key discussions, decisions and recommendations made at the Network meeting and the conference, as well as follow-up actions to be taken. We invite you to send us your feedback and suggestions.

Sincerely,

Robert Quinn
Director

Carla Stuart
Program Officer
HIGHLIGHTS

April 28th Network Meeting
- Reflections from SAR/SRF scholars
- Discussion on best practices of hosting scholars;
- Adoption of Network bylaws, as revised;
- Discussion of new membership structure & dues

April 29th “Global Strategies” Conference
- Lessons learned in assisting threatened scholars
- Strengthening outreach to threatened communities
- Increasing public awareness of value of academic freedom and current threats
- Developing universal standards of academic freedom across boundaries and cultures
- Recognizing local challenges to academic freedom and organizing effective responses

FOLLOW-UP

SAR staff
- reformat information on scholar-candidates for better use by SAR members/hosts
- finalize “How to Host” manual and possible orientation training for scholars/hosts
- circulate new membership and dues info for 2005-06; organize expanded SAR Board
- establish working-groups on key conference themes, soliciting SAR member-faculty and outside experts to participate. These may include: Academic Freedom Survey; Academic Freedom Dialogues (Latin America); SAR Network outreach/growth (including outreach to academic associations, US regional and UK/Europe); SAR/Students at Risk.

SAR members & others
- encourage your institution to be active in SAR including hosting a scholar visit or Speaker Series event; participating in SAR working groups; or serving on expanded SAR Board;
- share comments on “How to Host” manual; and
- help SAR Network to grow by urging neighboring institutions to join; inviting colleagues at other institutions to discuss SAR with their administration; and putting SAR on agenda for meetings of faculty, associations and higher education conferences

Institutions represented at the events:

AAAS Science & Human Rights Program
Bard College
Barnard College
Brooklyn College
Carnegie Council on Ethics & Int'l Affairs
Center for Global Partnership
Columbia University
Council for Assisting Refugee Academics
Duke University
European Humanities University
Fairfield University
Freedom House
Goucher College
Harvard University
IIE Scholar Rescue Fund
Illinois Wesleyan University
Indiana University, South Bend
Institute of International Education
International Association of Universities
Kent State University
Loyola University Chicago
Modern Language Association
National Academies of Science
Network for Education & Academic Rights
New York Academy of Sciences
New York University
Open Society Institute
PEN Canada
Purchase College, SUNY
Research Triangle Institute
Saint Mary’s College
Scholars at Risk
Social Science Research Council
Stanford University
Stony Brook SUNY
Syracuse University
Trinity College
University of California, Berkeley
Central University of Venezuela
Universidad de Monterrey
University of California, Davis
University of Chicago
University of Geneva
University of Liberia
University of Maryland
University of Michigan
University of Minnesota
University of Notre Dame
University of Richmond
University of Texas at Austin
University of Toronto
Vassar College
Washington College
Women’s WORLD
April 28th Network Meeting: Summary of discussions & outcomes

SAR Network director Robert Quinn welcomed everyone. Jacqueline Bhabha (Harvard University; Chair, SAR Network Advisory Board) then opened the meeting, inviting introductions from each participant.

How to Host a Scholar? A discussion with SAR/SRF scholars & hosts
The first session was moderated by Irving Epstein (Illinois Wesleyan University; Member, SAR Network Advisory Board) and Jan Pilarski (Saint Mary’s College, Member, SAR Network Advisory Board). Scholars from Iran, Liberia, Pakistan, Rwanda, Ukraine and Zimbabwe assisted by SAR/SRF shared their experiences as formerly threatened scholars.

Reflections from SAR/SRF scholars
SAR/SRF scholars expressed gratitude for the assistance they have received from SAR, SRF and their host campuses. All stressed the importance of contact with supportive people and groups.

All agreed also that some form of campus orientation would be helpful, of at least a few weeks and perhaps on-going throughout the visit. Several described cultural challenges, language difficulties and feelings of isolation. One scholar, for example, said “The first year [in exile] is a complete shock.” Another noted that the period after arrival involves “a very steep learning curve.” Regarding language, one scholar noted that even for those scholars who speak the language of the host campus, “there is a difference between what language you know and what is really spoken” by native speakers.

Many wrestle with the emotions of leaving family, country and even identity behind: One scholar expressed the feelings of many when she said, “I sometimes think ‘Who am I?’ In my country I was a famous lawyer, journalist and professor. But here... I do not know. I think at times of going back, even if it means I would be in prison.” Several noted that their days were generally full of campus activities—research, classes, talking with colleagues—but nights and weekends could be lonely, reminding them of everything left behind.

Many commented that a prescribed period of adjustment would be helpful for scholars escaping threats and coming to terms with the reality of exile. One scholar attributed his successful adjustment to the structure provided by his participation in a graduate study program and the opportunity to co-teach courses with regular faculty. Others described their coming to terms with the “challenge of competition” in the US academy, learning that beyond their credentials they had to learn to network and seek out opportunities. Many noted that US culture generally is more isolating and less supportive than their own culture, forcing them to become more independent but at times also causing confusion.

There was a general consensus that the challenges of adjustment as well as uncertainty about the future made a one year visit too short in many cases. Especially for those scholars unable to return to their home country in the near term because of security issues, a one-year term meant
that at the same time they were struggling with adjustment to campus and perhaps teaching new classes they were also forced to begin searching for jobs or other positions for after the visit term. Many feared the uncertainty of not knowing what they would do after the visit, and the uncertainty of whether they would feel compelled to return home. There was consensus that, at least for scholars unable to return to their home country within one year, a two-year visit would be preferable.

Discussion among SAR members and guests
SAR hosts discussed their experiences in making placements and visits successful. Several invited participants to consider opportunities for scholars, including teaching opportunities and when such were or were not suitable, opportunities for scholars as students or researchers. Others questioned the duration of any visits, urging that visits be of sufficient length.

One host highlighted the usefulness of bringing potential candidates to campus for a short orientation visit before a longer visit commences. Although not possible in many cases (because of the urgency of the scholar’s escape from threat) everyone agreed that orientation visits and advance interviews should be organized when practical.

One host emphasized that their campus viewed SAR membership, and hosting a scholar in particular, as a collective activity. They organized a local group to share responsibility and to help make others on campus aware of the scholar’s visit. Others echoed this sentiment, and encouraged hosts to invite visitors to interact with a broad range of campus communities and activities, both curricular and extra-curricular. Interaction with faculty in the scholar’s field is particularly helpful in restoring a visitor’s professional identity. Some campuses have designated specific faculty mentors for visitors, a practice others encouraged. Another host suggested linking visitors with existing campus services and communities, including for example with an international center or with other visiting scholars or fellows on campus.

Several hosts suggested specific changes to the information about candidates that SAR circulates including specific information about the scholar’s prior academic work and availability to teach, to research, to participate in seminars or public events or other activities.

Several hosts noted the challenge of timing visits to the academic calendar, something that is especially important when funding for the visit comes in part from teaching. Other hosts noted that teaching should not always be expected, and that demanding teaching loads can be detrimental to some scholars, making difficult adjustments even more challenging. Several hosts noted that in their experiences, the host campus and scholar benefit just as much, and perhaps more, from providing the visitor with space for research, writing and interaction with supportive colleagues. All of the scholars present echoed the view that while a teaching requirement could sometimes be an undue burden in the first year of exile, the opportunity to teach or especially to co-teach is generally welcome and helpful to the scholar’s adjustment.
Several representatives echoed the earlier comments from SAR/SRF scholars that one year visits were often not long enough for the visitors to adjust fully and to regain their professional identity. Others responded that asking for longer commitments from institutions was not practical, particularly from smaller institutions or new SAR members. There was discussion of the idea of co-hosting scholars in consortia of institutions, or of helping scholars transition from one institution to the next. It was felt that such arrangements might facilitate co-teaching and short-term visiting positions, particularly for smaller institutions. Rob Quinn indicated that SAR has experimented with both approaches, and that more concerted efforts would be made in the future. There was also some discussion of whether some SAR members might serve as “first responders,” in the sense of providing an initial host for scholars recently arrived, perhaps for a period of months or a semester, with the understanding and commitment from other SAR members that after orientation the scholars would move to another SAR member for a longer-term visit. It was agreed that the SAR office would explore this idea with the full membership.

There was support for the suggestion that SAR should make efforts to place scholars in their own geographic region, with several participants noting the difficulties some scholars have had in obtaining visas in the post-9/11 period and others noting that many international scholars and students have simply elected not to come to the US for education or conferences. Rob Quinn noted that SAR/SRF have already placed scholars in 16 countries, and that non-US placements and particularly placements within the scholar’s home region may be beneficial for many reasons in addition to visa issues, including language, cost, academic credentials and familiarity. Rob indicated that for these reasons, SAR has plans for significant international growth over the next two years, with the only obstacle being identifying the necessary resources to conduct outreach. (SAR has recently submitted a grant proposal seeking funds for outreach to the UK and Europe.) At the same time, SAR hosts and SAR/SRF scholars acknowledged that regional placement is not viable for many scholars (as when security issues cross borders) and moreover that SAR campuses, the Network and the US public benefit from hosting SAR/SRF scholars in the US.

Other recommendations include: SAR helping scholars to publicize and circulate their articles, books and other works; SAR linking exiled and refugee scholars with each other, so that they may share common experiences and feel less isolated; SAR encouraging members to view hosting responsibility as a collective experience—host campuses should be encouraged to form SAR committees with the support of senior administration; and host campuses should be encouraged to include SAR/SRF scholars in new faculty orientations, training workshops and other on campus trainings, and social and professional activities in the community.

The discussion concluded with a recognition that many of the proposals raised were ideal (like two year visits and increased funding for visits from SAR/SRF) but that SAR must continue to grow within the limits of available resources and SAR member support. As one participant summed up, “We must do what is possible, while we aim for what is most desirable.”
Report on the Status of the Scholars at Risk Network

Rob Quinn next gave a brief summary report of the state of the Network. He noted that operationally SAR has never been stronger, but that financial challenges threatened SAR’s ability to continue to grow and to take advantage of current opportunities.

Rob noted that since the last meeting in 2003, the SAR office has successfully relocated to New York University. The partnership with IIE in the creation of the Scholar Rescue Fund also has been strengthened and wonderfully successful, leading to more than $1 million awarded so far for the benefit of threatened scholars. Together, SAR/SRF and host institutions have provided more than $2 million to more than 90 scholars from 35 countries. Rob also indicated progress on the preparation of a manual of best practices for hosting scholars. He circulated the table of contents for the SAR ‘How to Host Manual’ and invited participants to review it and submit comments to the SAR office.

Rob concluded by noting that SAR is poised at an exciting moment of great opportunity, where over the next few years SAR could experience significant growth in membership (especially outside the US), significant increase in its ability to assist threatened scholars, and significant improvements in conditions of respect for academic freedom everywhere. The only obstacles to SAR’s taking up these opportunities are severe financial constraints confronting the SAR office. Without new sources of funding, SAR’s only program officer position will be eliminated at the end of the summer of 2005. Rob noted that he continues to seek funding from foundations and private individuals, and indicated that he is optimistic about two currently pending proposals. But he emphasized that the long-term health of the Network likely requires form of modest membership dues or subscriptions to help to cover basic operating costs. He reminded participants that SAR has never asked for financial contributions from members for the Network office, instead asking members to support events and visits to their campus by SAR/SRF scholars. He indicated however that SAR has matured to a place where the size of the Network membership and the related increase in office activities, as well as the expectations of foundations and potential donors, warranted some form of member contribution. A discussion of membership structure and dues then followed in the next session.

Next five years for SAR? A discussion of SAR operations

The final session was led by discussant Susan Gzesh (University of Chicago; Member, SAR Advisory Board) The participants were reminded that from 1999-2005 SAR has been organized informally, including elements of both a membership organization and sub-program of a host institution. As SAR has grown both in size and scope of operations, it has reached the place where a more formal membership and governance structure is warranted.

Toward that end, the participants briefly reviewed a proposed set of SAR Network bylaws. Rob Quinn explained that the bylaws as proposed were intended as a minimum statement of operational structure, under which the Network board would be empowered to adopt or amend
more detailed policies as might be required to meet particular circumstances and opportunities. The participants then reviewed the draft and suggested amendments, including: extending the term of board members from the proposed (1) to (2) years; staggering board members terms to ensure continuity of leadership; inclusion of (2) vice-presidents and an automatic advancement from first vice-president to president (modeled on various academic associations), again to ensure continuity in leadership; and a requirement of an annual report to the membership by the executive director. The participants then approved the bylaws, as amended, and directed the office to prepare and distribute the final version to all SAR members.

There next followed a discussion of Network membership criteria and structure. There was general support for a more formal membership structure, but equal agreement that the structure proposed in the pre-meeting materials was too complicated.

It was agreed that membership should be limited to higher education institutions and perhaps associations, while a “Friends of SAR” or other grouping could be established to encourage and recognize individual faculty and other contributors. It was also agreed that the membership structure should encourage one “class” of members equal in responsibilities and benefits. There was agreement, however, that an “affiliate” or “observer” category of membership with limited benefits and fewer obligations was acceptable as a means of retaining members and attracting new members. It was agreed that such category should be limited to a definite term, after which time institutions would be expected to become regular members. Some accommodation could be made to recognize member institutions that provide financial support for the Network at levels above any basic membership contribution, and incentives should be created to encourage such support. There was disagreement as to types of incentives (for example, whether the opportunity to host the Network Meeting would be viewed as an incentive), and objection to guaranteeing board membership to member institutions based on financial contributions alone.

The participants instructed the SAR office to review the membership proposal and to submit a simplified plan to the board for approval.

There then followed the related discussion of membership dues. There was widespread agreement that the Network had reached a point of development where modest dues were appropriate. There was brief discussion of the amount of dues, and whether dues should be scaled according to size of institution or other criteria. It was agreed that the dues structure should be simplified in line with the new membership structure, and that the level of dues should be determined in part by the operating costs of the office. The participants agreed that the executive director should determine a suitable dues level, in consultation with the board.

Meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m. to the NYU Torch Club for a reception and dinner.
April 29th Conference: “Global Strategies for Defending Academic Freedom”

Summary of conference discussions

Panel 1: Fellowships & visiting positions: How do they work? How effective are they?
Discussant: Farhad Kazemi, Professor, Department of Politics & Director, Hagop Kevorkian Center, New York University. Panelists: Elizabeth Cafferty, Council for Assisting Refugee Academics, UK; Robert Quinn, Director, Scholars at Risk Network; Henry Jarecki, Chair, Institute of International Education’s Scholar Rescue Fund; Isobel Harry, Executive Director, PEN Canada.

HIGHLIGHTS

- Number of threatened/exiled scholars worldwide underestimated: CARA alone supporting 50 scholars in UK annually; SAR/SRF supporting similar levels.
- Resources to assist candidates are essential. Institute of International Education’s commitment vital—goal of $50 million endowment for the Scholar Rescue Fund
- Similar problems for other populations, including writers, journalists, lawyers, artists and students. Some interest in exploring SAR hosts interested in helping students.
- Programs urged to consider differences in source and nature of risk—long vs. short-term.
- Differences in context important—in countries with public support for refugees maybe only supplemental support is needed, but without public support efforts must include allowances for costs of living, including families.
- Different challenges for programs assisting temporary exiles (those with expectation of return to home country in a year or so) and those helping refugees beginning a new life in the host country. The latter require help with training and credentialing.
- Consider menu of services or assistance, including some short-term or low cost, others longer-term and requiring greater commitment of resources (i.e., small one-time grants for some candidates and full, multi-year fellowships for others).
- Consider “employability” of candidates as criteria for selection, with the goal of giving candidates a fair chance to compete for positions on their own merits. Distinguish between employability in home country (if scholar able to return) and employability in new host country (if return is not possible).
- Include social and professional support in addition to financial support, university positions or re-training. Consider establishing alumni network and mentoring possibilities.
- Recognition that no program can do it all: Effort should be made to define services and to coordinate with other programs, including referring candidates to most suitable program.
Panel 2: Protection & Intervention Abroad: Alerts, Campaigns, Site-visits & Reports
Discussant: Robert Jones, Senior Vice President, University of Minnesota. Panelists: Vladimir Dounaev, Vice-Rector, European Humanities University, Belarus; Orlando Albornoz, Professor of Sociology, Universidad Central de Venezuela; John Akker, Executive Director, Network for Education & Academic Rights, UK; Carol Corillon, Executive Director, International Human Rights Network of the Academies & Scholarly Societies, National Academies of Science.

HIGHLIGHTS

- Efforts must be made to promote understanding of academic freedom as an *international* right, not merely a national issue, and should include discussion of *responsibilities* of higher education communities, state and public in exercise and defense of academic freedom.

- Academic freedom is more subtle than “Are scholars in jail or out of jail?” Authoritarian governments have learned to use intimidation, harassment and other means short of violent persecution to chill campuses without drawing attention.

- Not enough to take people out of the country. Must be proactive. Must make efforts to develop warning system. Must focus on addressing the *issue* and not the particular *event*.

- Public education is essential. The internet is an increasingly important tool for mobilizing the public.

- Letter campaigns and “alert” systems are important vehicles, but significant resources must be devoted to ensuring quality and accuracy of information, as only the slightest inaccuracies can result in long-term harm to credibility.

- Important to maintain polite, professional and respectful presentation, and to avoid political statements. Reliance on UN human rights treaty standards or other internationally recognized standard helpful.

- Other avenues for intervention include UNESCO Committee on Conventions and Recommendations, UN treaty monitoring committees and offices, embassies, and international academic networks and professional associations.

- Successful intervention takes time, persistence, commitment and good partners. Some cases continue for 10, 15 or more years (sadly), but commitment demonstrates seriousness. Co-sponsoring with prominent organizations or international scholars can increase effectiveness of interventions.

- Examination of the situation of the *European Humanities University*, closed by the government of Belarus last year. Widely believed to have been targeted for developing a modern, independent university and “new university culture” that authorities found threatening. Discussed need for international support for EHU as the administration reconstitutes the university in Lithuania—EHU welcomes international cooperation and partnerships. Example of a threat to academic freedom where sanctuary alone is not enough. Discussion of how SAR might intervene earlier in such cases.

- Difficulty of holding authorities accountable for attacks on academic freedom. Suggestions ranged from international condemnation and prosecution to engagement and dialogue about importance of academic freedom, university communities and international partnership.

- Recommendation that SAR should organized site-visits to international institutions under threat, including representatives of various SAR member institutions.

- Recommendation that SAR should hold meetings outside of the US, perhaps with UNESCO.
Panel 3: Indices, Goals & Benchmarks: Towards a Global Academic Freedom Index?

Discussant: Thomas Keenan, Director, Human Rights Project, Bard College. Panelists: Cynthia Irvin, Senior Researcher, Health Security Program, Research Triangle Institute; Christopher Walker, Director of Studies, Freedom House; Audrey Chapman, Director, Science & Human Rights Program, American Association for the Advancement of Science.

HIGHLIGHTS

- General agreement that creating a survey or index of academic freedom is possible and desirable. Significant challenges will have to be addressed, starting with the challenge of defining academic freedom: in addition to higher education factors, general conditions also impact academic freedom, including general levels of development, corruption and respect for fundamental political, civil, economic and social rights.

- Rooting definition and methodology in UN human rights framework will increase legitimacy and reinforce legal authority; although no specific international legal instrument yet on academic freedom, can make reference to UN treaty provisions and monitoring committee statements. Working with UNESCO, UN committees and officers also advisable.

- Indirect indicators will need to be developed to measure various elements of academic freedom. Important to test any indicators and invite comment and participation as means of getting by-in from key stakeholders.

- Some data might be available already, but access may be an issue. How might other data be generated? Local sources of information most desirable but most difficult to test. Should include efforts to improve the flow of data from countries where academic freedom is threatened. SAR members might partner with colleagues in these countries.

- Questions of scope will depend largely on resources. Multi-year funding should be identified so that survey has period of time to establish itself.

- Might start with a few countries, perhaps suspected worst offenders. Perhaps cross-section. Some concerns that selecting particular countries turns the process into a negative exercise, whereas global survey is more neutral or even positive if it inspires dialogue and cooperation.

- Important to consider ultimate goals: What type of tool do you want at the end of the process? How will information from the survey be circulated, especially within the most challenged countries? Recommendation that any survey include reporting levels: simplified for public and media; detailed for specialized media, policy-makers and experts. Overall recommendation not to expect perfection: accept compromises to get project going.

- Significant discussion and disagreement on the relative merits of quantitative versus qualitative methods, although general agreement that any survey should attempt to incorporate elements of both. Disagreement about merits of any numerical indexing or ranking, with some criticizing methodological weakness of such listings and inappropriateness of “naming and shaming” technique to complex area like higher education, while others mentioning powerful public education and media impact of such methods.

- Need to include in any survey a report clear statement of limits of methodology and utility of results, as well as a framework for post-report monitoring and follow-up dialogue.

- Recommend that SAR form a committee of SAR members and experts to continue discussion.
Panel 4: What is the role of the university in defending academic freedom globally?

Discussant: Srinivas Aravamudan, Professor of English & Director, Franklin Humanities Institute, Duke University. Panelists: Domna Stanton, Distinguished Professor, City University of New York & President, Modern Language Association; Lisa Anderson, Professor of Political Science & Dean, School of International & Public Affairs, Columbia University; Justin Thorens, Distinguished Professor, University of Geneva & Chair, International Association of Universities Task Force on Academic Freedom and University Autonomy.

HIGHLIGHTS

- Academic freedom is conceptually ambiguous but it must be defended; advocates must insist on the definitional complexity of academic freedom so as not to narrow its scope or impact.
- Attempts to draw boundaries or lines around activities implicating academic freedom—the classroom, published research, public statements—while generally flawed are nevertheless necessary for developing standards and courses of action. Related efforts should be made to define and recognize the shifting boundaries of the academy—increasingly research and teaching are being done outside of traditional university and college settings, and research that remains in traditional settings is increasingly controlled by business or government interests.
- Any definition should recognize developments in international human rights standards, and great efforts should be made to link with regional human rights groups and grassroots groups. In this way academic freedom might be considered one indicator of overall freedom in a society.
- Discussion of the history of academic freedom, which evolved from concept of autonomy (autonomy of university from interference by local or national authorities, granted to university by supra-national authority). Today’s understanding is very different. Also today an important distinction between US understanding of academic freedom (singular) and European understanding of academic freedoms (plural), reflecting European incorporation of concepts of responsibility and university autonomy where as US discussions generally focus on free expression.
- Interest in exploring the meaning and role of university autonomy in the US context, along with general agreement that US academics need to “make the case for why academic freedom is so important.” Recommendation that SAR consider activities to encourage US academics to do more to educate domestic audiences about the need for, and role of academic freedom in free societies.
- Recognizing academic freedom as a right implicates a corresponding duty on the part of academics to teach and to share knowledge with society. This in turn supports a corresponding responsibility of society to defend scholars when they are attacked for meeting their duty to the general good. SAR members and all institutions have a responsibility to defend threatened colleagues abroad.
- Discussion of the International Association of Universities and the report it prepared for UNESCO on the feasibility and desirability of a binding, international legal instrument on academic freedom. The report concluded that such an instrument is feasible and should be prepared. Recommendation that SAR explore how to support efforts at creating such an instrument.
Panel 5: Challenges to Academic Freedom locally: Reflections on recent events
Discussant: Catharine Stimpson, University Professor & Dean, Graduate School of Arts & Science, New York University. Panelists: Akeel Bilgrami, Professor of Philosophy and Director of the Heyman Center for Humanities, Columbia University; Roger Bowen, General Secretary, American Association of University Professors; Wendy Doniger, Distinguished Service Professor of History of Religions, the Divinity School, the University of Chicago; Martha Merritt, Associate Director, The Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, University of Notre Dame.

HIGHLIGHTS

- Discussion of recent incidents on US campuses, with general agreement that there is a need to distinguish incidents that implicate academic freedom from those that involve questions of political speech or other rights issues. Agreement that US academic communities could do more to educate US public about importance of academic freedom and its boundaries.

- Defining academic freedom clearly for all circumstances in difficult, but the AAUP 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure is a useful starting point for discussion.

- Many expressed concern that persons and groups outside higher education communities are manipulating incidents (and students) for purposes of advancing political or ideological views.

- Strong objection to recent efforts to impose hiring quotas based on particular points of view, especially political points of view and especially if determinations of “balance of views” are to be made outside of the academy. General agreement that appropriate criteria for hiring are those which measure quality of scholarship, research, writing and thinking as evaluated on their merits by experts within each field.

- Recognition also that attacks on US scholars can come from communities outside the US, such as those who feel a personal or political attachment to the subject matter of a scholar’s work. Particularly sensitive are cultural studies, religious studies and politics. US scholars face challenges of censorship and self-censorship when working in these areas.

- US scholars have been denied entry visas or work permits to continue research in other countries. Junior scholars and graduate students worry that working on sensitive topics could make it more difficult to get tenure or worry that their careers could be disrupted by sudden denial of access to sources and research areas in other countries.

- Discussion about how governments, administrators and other faculty should respond to various incidents, drawing lessons learned from recent experience.

- Institutional support for those involved is essential, including central administration, trustees, alumni and student body. Effort should be made to reach out to all constituencies, including local community, to understand various perspectives and to educate them about the facts of the situation as well as the importance of the academic freedom issues involved.

- Identifying sources of information and developing an ability to test and verify the accuracy of information and to respond to inaccuracies quickly will help, especially when dealing with the media. Developing a media strategy essential for communicating academic freedom message to the campus, the public and key stakeholders.

The conference concluded at 5:30 p.m. with a reception in the adjoining lounge.