

<https://www.historians.org/about-aha-and-membership/aha-history-and-archives/historical-archives/report-of-the-aha-committee-on-the-rights-of-historians>

Report of the American Historical Association Committee on the Rights of Historians (1974)

**By Sheldon Hackney, Elizabeth Brown, Winton U. Solberg, George V. Taylor, and Alfred Young
March 5, 1974**

Contents

[Executive Director's Preface](#)

[Committee Submission Letter](#)

[I. Foreword](#)

[II. Analysis of the Questionnaire](#)

[III. Analysis of Individual Cases](#)

[IV. Statement of Professional Standards](#)

[Appendix A: Tabulation of the Results of the Questionnaire](#)

[Appendix B: Excerpts from Reports on Cases and Conditions in the Questionnaires](#)

[Appendix C: Letter Sent to Historians on Violations of Academic Freedom](#)

[Appendix D: Letter Sent to Historians with Questionnaire](#)

Executive Director's Preface

In the foreword to its Final Report, the ad hoc Committee on the Rights of Historians describes the careful process that led to the writing of this report. When the committee submitted the report to the AHA Council in March 1974, a careful review was undertaken. The Council Committee on the Profession, under the guidance of its chairman, Otis L. Graham, Jr., gave the report thorough study and brought it before the full Council at its September meeting. On September 29, 1974, the Council voted to adopt the six recommendations in the foreword of the report and to publish the Statement of Professional Standards in the Newsletter.

Upon the recommendation of the Committee on the Profession, the Council, on December 27, 1974, voted to adopt and to publish the report. The Council has agreed to approve certain

additional changes recommended by the Committee on the Rights of Historians as a result of the reviews and discussions that had occurred since the report was originally submitted. The document as printed here reflects these changes.

The Final Report is now official AHA policy. We believe that the document provides an instructive evaluation of the state of academic freedom for historians. The recommendations offer guidance to the Association in responding to infringements of the rights of historians, and the Statement of Professional Standards offers a sound statement of policy to avoid such infringements. The AHA realizes that it cannot legislate for its members, but the standards proposed are ones that all historians and all departments should strive to attain. We hope that this document will foster discussion of these matters within departments and that you will share the report with your colleagues.

Mack Thompson, Executive Director

February 14, 1975

I. Foreword

Pursuant to a resolution adopted by the Business Meeting of the American Historical Association on December 29, 1970, the Council on January 23, 1971, authorized its Executive Committee to appoint a committee to investigate problems of academic freedom and "to draw up recommendations as to specific policies and practices the Association can consider for adoption." Reports of the resolution of the Business Meeting and of the action of the Council are contained in the March 1971 Newsletter. The Executive Committee completed appointments to the Committee on the Rights of Historians in April 1971, and the members of the ad hoc Committee gathered for the first time on June 3, 1971, in Washington, D.C.

Since its initial meeting, the Committee has actively solicited information from historians who believe their rights have been violated. The Committee not only advertised in the Newsletter but wrote directly to a large number of historians who had come to its attention in one of several ways as people involved in situations in which a violation of rights allegedly had occurred. In this way, the Committee eventually received enough information on thirty-eight cases to permit an understanding of the issues involved.

The Committee also formulated a questionnaire seeking information about existing practices in the profession and the opinions of members of the AHA about what criteria ought to be used in personnel decisions and other professional judgments in colleges and universities. Having sent the questionnaire to a 50 percent sample of the Association's membership, the Committee received 2,200 responses.

The Committee also held an open session at the annual AHA meeting in 1971 in New York. There, members of a large audience commented upon their understanding of the meaning of academic freedom, their perceptions of the nature of the current threats to it, and their suggestions as to how the Association might take supportive action.

The Committee conducted most of its internal communications by mail, but after its first meeting, it met five times to deliberate: at the annual meeting in New York in December 1971, during the convention of the Organization of American Historians in Washington in April 1972, at the annual meeting in New Orleans in December 1972 when it also conducted a discussion with members of the Review Board, in Princeton in April 1973, and finally in Princeton in January 1974.

On the basis of the information we have gathered we have concluded that the sense of the resolution which called for the creation of the Committee was correct: there is cause for concern about the state of academic freedom in the profession. Despite the fact that there can be no sure knowledge of the absolute level of infringements on the rights of historians nor any firm basis for knowing whether the trend is up or down, there are many allegations of unfair treatment and there is ample evidence that a significant proportion of the profession perceives injustices being done.

The sources of the threats to academic freedom are multifold. Though historians view administrations and boards of governors with more suspicion in this regard than they view faculty groups, history departments themselves are not immune from criticism. Similarly, the nature of the conflict giving rise to allegations of violations varies considerably, and we think we describe those conflicts in the sections that follow.

Remedies are more difficult to find than problems. The Committee was specifically charged with the task of evaluating "the need for an active program parallel to or supplementing that of the AAUP...before the AHA takes steps that would commit it to a complex and expensive operation that might in the event prove of limited value." Accordingly, the Committee has tried to determine if there are cases of a type peculiar to historians and cases which are not covered by AAUP procedures; it has also given careful consideration to the problems of cost and of effectiveness. It has concluded that there are no ways in which the academic freedom of historians differs in principle from that of other scholars, though historians may have a more fundamental interest than many other scholars in nondiscriminatory access to archives and research materials. As far as the Committee could determine, there is only one area in which professional judgments are made which is not now covered by AAUP machinery for redress of grievances: initial appointments.

The AHA is already doing several things that have a positive effect on academic freedom. When historians with academic freedom problems contact the national office of the AHA they are given informal advice and guided to the AAUP or some other appropriate agency. When institutions or other groups ask the AHA national office to assist in locating appropriate historians to serve as consultants in some capacity, the national office usually tries to be of assistance. These functions are very useful but do not go far enough in trying to meet the need.

The Committee considered and rejected several undertakings which it judged too ambitious for the AHA. These included the appointment of an AHA ombudsman; assessing AHA members or raising donations for a fund to support historians in their attempts to defend themselves against violations of their rights; and the appointment of a standing committee of the AHA to concern itself with problems of academic freedom. Because of the expense, the availability of AAUP services, the difficulties of securing evidence, and the uncertainty of achieving significant results,

the Committee decided against recommending the establishment by the AHA of elaborate, permanent machinery.

The Committee strongly believes, however, that the Association should increase its activities in support of academic freedom. Most important, the Committee has become convinced that considerable confusion and lack of understanding exist throughout the profession about the meaning of academic freedom and about the rights and responsibilities of historians as scholars and teachers. The Committee has therefore drafted a statement of standards designed to supplement and complement those of the AAUP. It is included below in the "Statement of Professional Standards" and is recommended for adoption by the AHA in the normal manner.

The Committee believes that such a statement, if adopted, would deter violations of academic freedom by increasing the profession's level of awareness of the rights and duties of a historian and by clarifying the principles which ought to guide professional conduct. The statement serves also to stress the importance to the achievement of a climate in which academic freedom flourishes of regular and fair procedures of governance. Furthermore, should a dispute arise, the existence of a formal set of principles which are widely accepted should make it easier for the parties to the dispute to discuss and reach agreement on their differences.

In addition, the Committee makes the following six recommendations which it hopes the Council will put into operation as soon as possible.

1. The executive director should designate a person in the national office, part of whose duties would be to counsel members of the profession who seek advice about their rights, to provide mediating services when such action seems appropriate, to refer complainants to other agencies for assistance, to keep under observation the state of academic freedom in the profession and to report periodically to the Council.
2. The AHA professional division should be prepared to investigate and recommend action to the Council in cases involving equal access to research materials in the possession of governmental agencies and to scholarly rights, privileges, and opportunities provided by these agencies.
3. The AHA should provide assistance, upon request, in identifying scholars able to render judgments on the published scholarship of individuals.
4. The AHA should provide assistance, upon request, in identifying scholars able to visit institutions and render advice on programs, governance, or other problems.
5. The AHA should encourage departments to provide orientation to their graduate students in the principles of academic freedom and tenure, and professional ethics and responsibilities.
6. The AHA should at the annual meeting conduct sessions dealing with academic freedom and tenure, and professional ethics and responsibilities and use the AHA Newsletter to inform its membership about these concerns.

II. Analysis of the Questionnaire

In an attempt to assess as systematically as possible historians' experiences and their opinions regarding their rights and responsibilities, the Committee circulated a lengthy questionnaire during the winter of 1971-1972. After consulting experts, the Committee finally decided to use an extensive set of questions, involving 119 separate, responses, most of which proved to be revealing and useful, despite some ambiguities which emerged when answers were tabulated. The Committee's decision to circulate a lengthy document was made in hopes of illuminating as many facets as possible of a complicated and subtle problem, and with full awareness of the consequent risk of limiting the number of respondents.

A 50 percent sample of the entire AHA membership was drawn proportionally by states and randomly within each state so that approximately 8000 questionnaires were mailed. Responses were received from 2200 historians, or 27.5 percent of those polled, which is within the normal range of response to a mail questionnaire. To conduct telephone interviews of nonrespondents was beyond the resources of the Committee.

Considering the length and complexity of the questionnaire, the response was gratifying, but the accuracy with which the results reflect the opinions of the entire membership of the AHA—or of the profession as a whole—naturally depends on whether or not the historians who responded are representative of those who were polled, the entire population of the AHA, or of the profession. One might suspect, for instance, that the views of the less affluent, the young, members of ethnic minorities, and those who feel themselves somehow outside the mainstream of the profession are not adequately reflected in the responses, either because they did not respond to the questionnaire or because they are not affiliated with the AHA. Because the AHA has no statistical profile of its membership, a rigorous comparison of the characteristics of the respondents and the characteristics of the membership is impossible. Nonetheless, if historians as a group are assumed to be similar in their age, rank and salary distribution to faculty members in general, the profile provided by the survey of 42,345 faculty members by the American Council on Education, *Teaching Faculty in Academe: 1972-73*, can serve as a gauge of the respondents' representativeness. The comparison of results is reassuring.

Our sample of historians appears strikingly similar to the ACE profile of faculty members in institutions of higher education in age, rank, ethnic composition, and tenure in administrative positions. The income distribution in our sample of historians is weighted more heavily toward the lower end of the salary scale than that of the ACE sample, and the political self-descriptions are apparently more liberal. Our sample is biased against those groups whose rights are most often violated—the young, the non-tenured, women, and ethnic minorities—but this may reflect the actual structure of the profession. From the institutional standpoint, there may be some underrepresentation of junior colleges, community colleges, and colleges which are predominantly black. On the other hand, cross-tabular analysis correlating age, rank, tenurial status, and institutional affiliation with responses to questions dealing with limitations of permissible behavior did not reveal notable variations in attitude. Thus the slight bias of the questionnaire in favor of the comfortable and satisfied members of the profession seems unlikely to have exercised much effect on the general pattern of responses.

After examining the responses and analyzing 948 individual cross-tabulations as cautiously as possible, the Committee concluded that the state of academic freedom in the historical profession is poor. This conclusion was reached with clear realization that the results of the questionnaire might be interpreted in a more positive manner. Question 25, for example, found only 8.4 percent of the respondents working in situations in which they had reason to fear that unorthodox opinions would be penalized. Answers to question 26 revealed that 90 percent of the respondents had themselves never experienced any infringement of their rights, even to the extent of receiving friendly advice about how to conduct themselves. Fewer than 1 percent of the respondents had suffered dismissal as a result of political activity. Despite the crises which the nation's campuses have experienced in the preceding five years, only 8.5 percent of our respondents felt threatened in any way by strikes, moratoria, or other movements on campus. The responses to question 19 and 20 indicate that a majority of the respondents have no personal knowledge of cases in which a faculty member's political views caused the faculty member not to be hired or not to be retained.

Despite these statistics, a pessimistic assessment seems justified. A significantly large minority—21 percent to 34 percent—know of instances in which the political views of a faculty member at their institution influenced judgments of scholarly and pedagogic competence. More-over, when the responses to question 19 and question 20 are combined with the various components of question 22, it becomes clear that the majority of respondents believe that personnel decisions are affected by unwarranted discrimination of various sorts. Thirty percent of the respondents believe that they must mute, suppress, or be penalized for expressing unorthodox opinions. According to the responses to question 23, 27.7 percent of the respondents teach at institutions where, in the preceding five years, departmental recommendations on appointment, advancement, and tenure were overruled by administrators or trustees for unjustifiable reasons. Thirty-seven percent of the respondents teach in departments where the anticipated reaction of the administration or the trustees is taken into account when candidates are nominated. About 25 percent of the respondents have some reason to believe that radical political beliefs or activity affect personnel decisions in their departments (question 22, parts 5 and 7), while approximately 16 percent believe that the same is true for right-wing political beliefs or activity (question 22, parts 6 and 8). It is true that only .7 percent of the respondents have been dismissed or have had their salaries reduced because of off-campus political activities, but this represents at least twelve members of our profession who have suffered. All these facts convinced the Committee that there is cause for concern.

In its analysis of respondents' reports of infringements of academic freedom, the Committee was impressed by the following correlations. The questionnaire reveals that the younger, lower-ranking, non-tenured, and less conservatively oriented members of the AHA are on the whole more inclined to believe that candidates for jobs are discriminated against for their controversial political views (see Tables 1 and 2). Members in these categories are also more likely to acknowledge having perceived violations of academic freedom (see Table 3). While there are no apparent regional differences in experiences involving breeches of academic freedom, differing modes of departmental administration appear to be closely correlated with such breeches. *The form of governance most frequently associated with infringement of academic freedom is that in which the department chairman makes decisions with little consultation.* The administration, with or without consultation, performs better than the strong chairman. The lowest incidence of violation—29 percent knowledge of violations as opposed to 50 percent in systems dominated by

strong chairmen—occurs in departments in which all faculty members participate in personnel decisions.

Universities are apparently more tolerant than colleges, and private non-religious institutions are more tolerant than institutions supported by state or local governments. Cross-tabulation of questions 20 and 15 revealed that almost half (42.7 percent) of the 461 who responded from state supported four-year colleges with Masters programs, and 41.3 per-cent of the 481 who responded from state universities, reported knowledge of a historian who had lost his job within the preceding five years be-cause of controversial political views. The comparable responses from private non-religious schools of the same description were 27.7 percent and 24.2 percent. In general there is more tolerance of right-wing than of left-wing political views and activities, in both history departments and school administrations, although departments tend generally to be slightly more tolerant of dissent in all types of institutions than do ad-ministrations.

Some aspects of these patterns change if the focus is shifted from the area of politics to that of morals. Not only are homosexuals discriminated against more than political dissenters, but they receive least tolerance at religious schools and most at state universities (see question 29, part 14, and question 15). The situation is the same for personal sexual morality (question 29, part 15, and question 15).

The fourth section of the questionnaire, dealing with opinions rather than experience, casts light on the attitude of our profession toward crucial questions of academic freedom. The survey shows that

an impressive number of the respondents are prepared to tolerate or support the principles of diversity and pluralism. Fifty-nine percent of the respondents believe that ideological diversity is a positive good which should be encouraged; 27 percent think it should be irrelevant (question 30; see Table 4). Methodological diversity is viewed as a positive good by 80 percent of the respondents, while 8.4 percent believe it should be irrelevant (question 31). There is, nevertheless, a striking variety of opinion about what sorts of considerations ought to influence professional judgments and behavior. Approximately half the respondents believe that political beliefs and activities should never be considered in personnel decisions, while another quarter of the respondents would like to see them taken into account in the interest of diversity (question 29, parts 5-8). Implicit in the stand taken by the latter group of respondents is the assumption that it would be legitimate to inquire into these aspects of candidates' lives. Similarly, responses to question 29, parts 9 and 16, reveal fundamental disagreement concerning the ethical obligations of the teacher in the classroom. Only 49.5 percent of the respondents thought it impermissible for teachers persistently to introduce extraneous material and to use the classroom for purposes of indoctrination—a practice specifically deplored in the 1940 AAUP Statement of Principles. Answers to this question show no significant differences by institutional affiliation, although self-styled liberals were slightly less willing than others to allow personnel decisions to be influenced by the candidates' abuse of the classroom. It is also striking that 40.6 percent of the respondents consider off-campus disruption an offense for which an institution may penalize a teacher, despite the fact that the external community possesses courts and machinery to deal with such matters. The responses to the questions also reveal thorough division, weighted slightly on the side of tolerance, on the question of whether homosexuality or personal sexual morality should legitimately affect decisions about appointment, renewal, and promotion.

Interestingly, cross-tabulation of the responses to question 29, sections 5 and 6, and question 5 showed no significant differences by tenure status in attitudes about whether or not right- or left-wing political beliefs or activities should be taken into account in personnel decisions. Nor do the responses to question 30 and question 5 reveal any differences by tenure status in attitudes toward the value of ideological or methodological diversity. With regard to homosexuality and personal sexual morality, however, historians with continuing tenure tended to be less tolerant than those with less secure statuses.

The last two questions attempted to measure historians' attitudes toward the existing modes of protecting academic freedom. The responses to question 33 reveal a distressingly low level of faith in the effectiveness of boards of trustees and school administrations in this respect. Approximately half the respondents expressed confidence, however, in chairmen, faculties, and faculty committees. As far as the AAUP is concerned, 53.5 percent of the respondents think that the national AAUP would oppose a violation of academic freedom with determination, while 22.1 percent think it would protest but take no determined action. Question 34 found 42.6 percent of the respondents satisfied with the status quo, although 9 percent expressed a rather fatalistic lack of faith in any agency's ability to shore up the boundaries of academic freedom. *In view of these figures, it may be surprising that 43.5 percent of the respondents want the AHA to play a more active role in defending academic freedom.* Cross-tabulations between the responses to question 34 and to various questions in Sections I and II indicate that there is no close correlation between the desire for the AHA to play a more active role, and age, sex, region of the country, form of decision-making experienced, or institutional affiliation. Non-tenured faculty and those identifying themselves as politically liberal tend to want more AHA activism than their fellow respondents. While the respondents favoring intervention and activism on the part of the AHA do not constitute a majority, it is yet noteworthy that many of those who at the present moment are satisfied and do not feel threatened are still not convinced that the situation is so secure that additional measures to protect academic freedom are unnecessary.

The data from the questionnaire responses, coded for computer manipulation, are on file on magnetic tape in the offices of the AHA.

III. Analysis of Individual Cases

Introduction

Since the AHA Council requested the Committee to "receive and solicit reports of individual instances or allegations of the violation of the rights of teachers and students of history," the Committee sent a form letter to individuals who were reported to have personal knowledge of the violation of the rights of a historian, asking for a brief narrative and supporting documentation. The letter asked specifically "how the procedures in the case deviate from the normal practice at the institution in question, what assistance was sought from outside groups (e.g., AAUP, ACLU), and what action these groups took." It also asked for an opinion as to what the AHA "might do to be of help" in such cases.

The Committee has information on thirty-eight cases. As used here the word case is roughly synonymous with complaint or allegation. Of the thirty-eight cases for which the Committee has case histories, most occurred from 1967 through 1972, and five between 1962 and 1967. One

case alleges violations beginning in 1942. The number thirty-eight is somewhat misleading, since several cases involve departments in which a number of individuals were not renewed. Several individuals, moreover, allege violations of their rights at more than one institution. One outstanding case alleges non-appointment on political grounds at eleven institutions; another involves an individual who was not renewed at two places and not hired at a third. Thus, if all the individuals involved are counted the total is thirty-three. In all, about fifty institutions were involved.

The Committee has also received about eighty claims of cases on the questionnaire distributed by the AHA. A few of these are signed and identify the institution at which the violation allegedly occurred, but most are unsigned, describe unnamed schools, and are undocumented. Appendix B contains excerpts from these statements. These claims are not analyzed in the report that follows.

The Committee is painfully aware of the limitations of the evidence, even in the full case histories. First, it is for the most part supplied by only one side to the dispute. In conformity with the instructions of the Council, the Committee made no effort to obtain evidence from the other side, either from interested or disinterested parties. Nevertheless, many of the individuals who communicated with the Committee provided documentation presenting some of the perspectives of the other side, and for six cases there are published reports of full-scale investigations by Committee A of the AAUP.

Second, the quality of the evidence varies from only the briefest statement from an individual to full sets of documents and corroborating materials, including newspaper and magazine articles. The evidence in about half the cases falls between these two extremes. Although mindful of the problems posed by the nature of the evidence at its disposal, the Committee believes that the evidence permits an analysis of grievances felt by historians. [Sections of the report describing individual cases that the committee investigated have been omitted to protect the privacy of the individuals involved. The omitted pages concern brief categorizations of the aspects of five initial appointment cases, six cases of dismissal before the end of a contract, twenty-one cases stemming from the non-renewal of probationary appointments, five reports of departmental conflict so extensive that a large-scale exodus ensued and numerous points of conflict were apparently involved, three cases of alleged improper interference with the content of a course, two cases of governmental rights and privileges being withdrawn in a discriminatory way, and two individuals who felt that private foundations and institutes were illegitimately discriminatory in making their awards. The causes of the cases vary. Political activity and advocacy, grading standards, educational philosophy, the use of adverse student evaluations, modes of dress and behavior, and a change in one's field of scholarly specialization are all alleged to have stimulated violations of academic freedom. No type of institution holds a monopoly on the violations brought to our attention in these individual cases, and historians appear among the oppressors as well as among the victims.]

Summary

1. The statements presented to the Committee provide evidence of a problem of serious proportions confronting the profession
2. The aggrieved, i.e., those who believe their rights have been violated, are varied in background. Political radicals, as might be expected, figure prominently, yet they

constitute a minority of all cases. The typical "victim" is more likely to be a young scholar who clashes with an "old guard" over a variety of educational and scholarly issues and suffers because of arbitrary governance and the absence of due process. A number of comments on the questionnaires (printed in Appendix B) suggest many perceive a "liberal" establishment at many institutions which discriminates against political conservatives. There are, however, few "conservative" victims save for a few whose academic standards, particularly grading procedures, might put them in that category.

3. The statements demonstrate that any case affects many more historians than the individual victim. In appointment cases the judgments of entire departments are overridden. In the "total department situations" departments are racked by controversy, low morale, and constant changes in personnel.
4. Most of the cases reported to the Committee were not resolved to the satisfaction of the individuals concerned. Most in fact were not resolved at all. Many individuals have gone on to other jobs, but many have not, and some consider themselves "blacklisted."
5. The AAUP, the single organization most looked to by historians to protect academic freedom, was effective in some types of cases, but was ineffective or did not function in other types of cases. The dismissal cases reported to the Committee were almost all taken up by AAUP with positive results. The AAUP functions well on what the report has called "traditional" cases, in which outside or administrative pressure is brought to bear against an individual or department: On the other hand the cases received by the Committee suggest there is no AAUP presence on appointments and that the AAUP is perceived by the complainants as inadequate to deal with the "newer" types of cases involving such issues as educational radicalism and questions of politics and scholarship. In these cases the aggrieved apparently assume that the AAUP might be on "the other side" or would not be interested. Many of these cases are fraught with significance for the historical profession.

IV. Statement of Professional Standards

The Ad Hoc Committee on the Rights of Historians proposes that the following statement of standards of academic freedom and fair professional practice be forwarded to the Council for review and adoption by the association. These standards reflect opinions and values developed by historians over a long period of time. They are supplemental to and consistent with those endorsed by the American Association of University Professors.

1. Historical study, disciplined by methodological rigor, has traditionally been characterized by a variety of interpretations and types of inquiry. Its vitality and development have depended on continuous colloquy among historians of diverse points of view. Respect for diversity, nurtured by experience in historical study, should appear in historians' regard for one another, in the way they govern their academic departments and their professional associations, and in the criteria and practices which govern their decisions regarding members of the profession. It is expected that historians, as faculty members, will use their best efforts to meet the highest levels of the standards described below.
2. Effective governance requires that decision-making in a department be shared. Such governance, commonly called collegial, fosters understanding, fairness, and a sense of common purpose. Many varieties of collegial government can accomplish these aims. In all of them the chairman, even when not de jure responsible to his colleagues, shares

decision-making with them because they are qualified professionals whose judgment is needed and should be sought, although the extent of consultation may vary from issue to issue.

3. Primary responsibility for determining membership and status in the faculty of a college or university belongs to the faculty. Departments should base recommendations for appointment, reappointment, promotion, tenure, or nonrenewal on professional criteria alone, and administrations and governing boards should override such recommendations only rarely and for compelling reasons stated in detail. When an administration or governing board disagrees with a departmental recommendation, every effort should be made to resolve the disagreement through mutual consultation. If the department's recommendation is overridden without compelling reasons stated in detail, the rights of both the department and the candidate have been violated. A department in such a position should seek a reversal, enlisting the support of the entire faculty of the institution and, if necessary, of appropriate professional associations. Faculties should endeavor to establish in administrations and governing boards full understanding of professional values and, where satisfactory processes of appointment and review are lacking, obtain institutional adherence to the 1966 "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities" (jointly formulated by the AAUP, the American Council of Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges), or some acceptable approximation of that statement.
4. Every candidate for appointment, reappointment, promotion, or tenure, and graduate students seeking positions, awards, and fellowships, should be evaluated exclusively on professional criteria, and no consideration should be given to race, color, sex, sexual orientation, religion, national origin, beliefs, life style, or the manner of exercising civil rights except insofar as, in the interest of diversity, such attributes might be of positive professional value. Professional criteria are those appropriate and necessary to the judgment of scholarship, teaching, and service, and they include competence, integrity, and commitment to reasoned discourse.
5. Competence in a field of historical scholarship includes, but is not limited to, mastery of the primary and secondary sources, analytical ability, methodological rigor, capacity for interpretation, originality, thoroughness, and skill in writing. Competence in teaching includes, but is not limited to, mastery of the scholarship, clarity in explanation, and the ability to stimulate students and develop their capacities for criticism and interpretation. Competence in service should be evaluated on the basis of achievement in contributions to the institution, the profession, or professionally-related public activities.
6. Integrity in scholarship requires a readiness to follow sound method and analysis wherever they may lead, an awareness of one's own bias, and acknowledging one's debt to others. Indifference to error, or efforts to ignore or conceal it, should stand to the professional discredit of a historian. Integrity in teaching involves presenting the substance and variant interpretations of the material covered in the course with intellectual honesty, fairness in judging students' work on its academic merits alone, and readiness to discuss students' views with open-mindedness and on their intellectual merits. Integrity in service involves the exercise of all those qualities that enable colleagues to have confidence in one another and, with mutual respect, to pursue common goals.
7. Historical scholarship and collegiality require an open exchange of opinion and knowledge. A commitment to reasoned discourse is professionally valued because it is necessary for fruitful exchange among colleagues and between teachers and students.

Such a commitment does not require "compatibility," which might be construed as requiring junior colleagues, whatever their knowledge and convictions, to be compatible with seniors on terms laid down by seniors. Nor does such a commitment preclude the expression of differences of opinion with candor, forcefulness, or persistence.

8. The political, social, religious, and ideological beliefs of historians, when applied with professional integrity, may furnish organizing principles for scholarship and teaching. The right to hold such convictions and express them in teaching does not, however, justify the persistent intrusion of material unrelated to the subject of the course, or the intentional use of falsification, misrepresentation, or concealment, or the abuse of academic and psychic authority to intimidate students.
9. Intellectual pluralism strengthens the vigor and freedom of academic life. Efforts to exclude one or more political or philosophic stances from a faculty, or from one or more of its departments, tend to destroy pluralism, reduce the variety of options that emanate from intellectual convictions, and weaken the vitality of the academic enterprise.
10. Disrupting classes, research, public lectures and discussions, or other academic activities violates the freedom of those whose teaching, discourse, and study would be affected and is not a permissible exercise of academic freedom. Historians, having the same political rights as all citizens, should, provided they do not represent themselves as spokesmen for their institutions, be free from institutional penalties or discipline for extramural political activities. Conviction for criminal activity should not be held to the professional discredit of a historian unless it clearly demonstrates unfitness for historical scholarship and teaching.
11. As members of the academic community, historians have the right to advocate institutional change, including the right to criticize their colleagues, departments, administrative officials, and governing boards.
12. Departments of history and institutions of higher learning should extend toleration to various life styles. Modes of dress, appearance, sexual orientation, and other features of life styles historians may choose to adopt should not affect professional evaluations. It is, however, recognized that some special-purpose institutions such as religious seminaries and military academies, because of their conceptions of their missions, restrict the range of permissible life styles. Such institutions should announce the restrictions in position descriptions published during recruiting.
13. Freedom of teaching is essential to the task of communicating historical thought and learning and includes the following:
 - (1) Teachers should write the descriptions of, and share in preparing syllabi and choosing books for, the courses they teach and should have substantial latitude in realizing the objectives of such course, but they are obligated to see that their courses reasonably correspond in coverage and emphasis to the accepted or published descriptions. Where they believe these descriptions inappropriate they should seek to have them changed.
 - (2) Teachers should have freedom of interpretation, subject to professional standards of competence and integrity.
 - (3) Teachers should grade and evaluate the work of their students honestly and according to their best judgment, subject to standards determined by the faculty and the rights of students to appeal for cause and on reasonable grounds against the grade assigned, or the evaluation made. The prerogative of determining requirements for degrees belongs to the faculty, and standards for grading and evaluation, as prescribed by the faculty, constitute an aspect of these requirements.

- (4) Teachers should be encouraged to explore new modes of instruction, examination, and grading, after consulting with the department or appropriate authority.
14. Fair practice in recruitment for and appointment to departments of history requires that positions be accurately described and announced in professional publications so that all professionally qualified persons may apply. After the search has begun, descriptions should not be altered for the purpose of excluding applicants thought undesirable on non-professional grounds. Applicants should ask to be considered only for positions for which they possess the listed qualifications, and departments need acknowledge only applications from qualified applicants. In judging candidates a department should employ only professional criteria. Applicants no longer under consideration should be notified promptly to that effect. Appointment should, whenever possible, be preceded by a visit to the institution. Interviews should be marked by frankness and respect for individual dignity on both sides, and questions related to irrelevant criteria should not be raised. Procedures and standards governing graduate student awards and fellowships should conform to the criteria set fourth above.
15. Procedures for reviewing candidates for reappointment, promotion, and tenure must provide full justice both for the candidates and for the departments and institutions involved. Candidates must be reviewed on the clear understanding that their careers are in the balance; at the same time, the welfare of the department and the institution must be respected. Decisions on personnel matters should be reached in accordance with established procedures, preferably written, known to all members of the department. Such procedures should lead to reports that are truthful, comprehensive, and consistent with the standards of academic freedom and fair professional practice. They should provide for professional review, appropriate notification, and appeal for reconsideration.
- (1) Professional Review. A candidate should be judged only on professional criteria, according to clearly formulated and written standards of the department. The relative weight to be attached to scholarship, teaching, and service should be determined by the department and the institution and conveyed to the candidate before appointment. Scholarship, teaching, and service should be conscientiously evaluated by the candidate's colleagues, and the candidate should have ample opportunity to provide a record of activities and achievements, and evidence of professional merit. If no member of the department is qualified by training or scholarly experience to review the candidate's scholarship, extramural evaluation by an authority considered by all the involved parties to be disinterested and qualified should be obtained.
- (2) Appropriate Notification. The department should promptly notify the candidate of its decision. Normally, the reasons should also be given. If the candidate requests to be informed in writing of the reasons for a recommendation against appointment, promotion, or award of tenure, the department should explain the possible adverse consequences of confirming the oral statement in writing. Should the candidate persist in the request for a written statement of reasons, it is recommended that written reasons be given.
- (3) Appeal for Reconsideration. If the department recommends against reappointment, promotion, or award of tenure, the candidate should have an opportunity to appeal the decision on grounds of inadequate procedures, failure to exclude non-professional criteria, incompleteness of the evidence considered, or other procedural defects. If, on review, the department's procedures are found defective, it should reconsider its conclusions.
16. The dismissal or suspension of a historian with tenure or a historian on special or probationary appointment must embody procedures of academic due process offering

safeguards against injustice and unprofessional judgment equal to those set forth in the AAUP's "Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure."

Appendix A: Tabulation of the Results of the Questionnaire

The following questions about you as an individual are designed to make it possible to correlate the personal characteristics of respondents with their observations and opinions regarding academic freedom. Please check or circle the correct option or that which is most nearly correct. The relative frequency of the responses in percentages is included in brackets after each possible choice. [Editor's note--brackets were removed in the web version of this report.]

Appendix B: Excerpts from Reports on Cases and Conditions in the Questionnaires

The Committee collected excerpts from the questionnaires that show that many historians believe that they have personal knowledge of cases in which academic freedom has, for many different reasons, been over-ridden. These excerpts have been omitted to protect the privacy of the respondents.

Appendix C: Letter Sent to Historians on Violations of Academic Freedom

Princeton University

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
129 DICKINSON HALL
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY 08540

August 5, 1971

Dear ____,

The Committee on the Rights of Historians of the American Historical Association is attempting to assess the current state of academic freedom for historians. We understand that you may have some personal knowledge of a case involving the violation of the rights of a historian. We would very much appreciate your taking the time to write a brief narrative of the case to help us in our task.

The case histories we collect in' this way are for the benefit of the Committee alone and will not be divulged to any other person or group, nor will we mention any individuals by name in our reports. Should you wish any additional measures for the protection of confidentiality, we would be happy to comply with your wishes. You should also realize that the Committee on the Rights of Historians is an investigatory body which hopes to make recommendations for action to the AHA, but the Committee is not authorized to take any action on its own or to serve as counsel or advocate in any case.

We are interested in learning not only about the frequency of problems involving violations of academic freedom but, more importantly, we want to know what form the threats to academic freedom are now taking in order to determine what new principles or procedures might be needed. Typically, cases arise when non-professional criteria are used in making decisions on initial employment advancement or tenure, but that is far from the only context imaginable. We would also be interested, for example, in situations which raise the issue of the freedom of the classroom or which grow out of on-campus conflict.

Whatever the context, we would like to have a description of the events of the case in as accurate an detailed fashion as you can provide, including whatever documentation you have. It would be particularly useful for us to know what procedures (notification, preferring charges, holding of hearings, etc.) were used in your case and how they deviated from the normal practice at the institution in question, what assistance was sought from outside groups (e.g. AAUP, ACLU, etc.), what action those groups took, why they declined to act, or in what ways their action may have been ineffective. What do you think the AHA as a professional organization might do to be of help in cases such as the one you describe or in those you can imagine?

Your help in this crucial undertaking will be very important.

Sincerely,

Sheldon Hackney for the Committee
Elizabeth Brown
Alfred Young
Winton U. Solberg
George V. Taylor

Appendix D: Letter Sent to Historians with Questionnaire