

JACA
2(1996):111-123

Censorship of the Collegiate Presses

SERJIT KASIOR
ED DARRAH

INTRODUCTION

CENSORSHIP policies have been actively pursued, over the past six years, at American publicly supported institutions of higher learning. University presidents, administrators and student government associations are violating the United States Constitution's First Amendment's protection of free speech, expression and the student press. These policies directly conflict with numerous rulings made by the American judiciary system since the Alabama U.S. District Court's 1967 *Dickey v. Alabama State Board of Education* decision (*Dickey v. Alabama State Board of Education*, 1967).

There are those who still refuse to accept the facts that the American judicial system has:

- Determined both students and faculty members have the constitutional right to express their individual or collective thoughts to all people within or outside of their communities (*Herman v. University of South Carolina*; *Jervey v. Martin*; *Pickings v. Bruce*; and *Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District*). (Avery & Simpson, 1987, Page 3, 9-10; Barron, 1973, Page 39; Ingelhart, 1986, Page 30-31, 98; Ryan and Martison, 1986, Page 55; Stevens & Webster, 1973, Page 5-6; Walden, 1985, Page 617).
- Extended the First Amendment's protection of a free press and the freedom of speech and expression to student publications (*Antonelli v. Hammond*; *Aumiller v. University of Delaware*; *Bistrick v. University of South Carolina*; *Trujillo v. Love*; and *Veed v. Schwartzkoft*). (Avery & Simpson, 1987, Page 7-10; Barron, 1973, Page 40-41;

Ingelhart, 1986, Page 31, 33, 38, 80; Stevens & Webster, 1973, Page 12, 14-15, 55; Walden, 1985, Page 616, 618, 623-624).

- Clearly defined what a student publication is and how it should function (*Arrington v. Taylor*; *Associates & Aldrich Co. v. Time-Mirror Co.*; *Avis v. Rutgers*; *Bazaar v. Fortune*; *Joyner v. Whiting*; *Kania v. Fordham*; *Lee v. Board of Regents*; *Milliner v. Turner*; and *Papish v. University of Missouri Board of Curators*). (Avery & Simpson, 1987, Page 9-10, 24, 30-31, 48-53; Barron, 1973, Page 30-31; Ingelhart, 1986, Page 32-33, 35, 38, 50, 79; Stevens & Webster, 1973, Page 50-51, 60, 65-67; Walden, 1985, Page 616-618).
- Held no state supported institution of higher learning can suppress a student's constitutional rights of free speech and free expression unless the student's actions presents a clear and present danger to the institution's educational processes (*Bazaar v. Fortune*; *Channing Club v. Board of Regents at Texas Tech University*; *Healy v. James*; *Saunders v. Virginia Polytechnic Institute*; *Sill v. Pennsylvania State University*; *Trotman v. Board of Trustees of University of Nebraska at Lincoln*; and *Veed v. Schwartzkoft*). (Avery & Simpson, 1987, Page 10,18, 24, 31, 53; Ingelhart, 1986, Page 31, 33-35, 37, 78, 87-88; Stevens & Webster, 1973, Page 16-17; Walden, 1985, Page 616,618,620).
- Declared a publicly supported state institution of higher learning cannot remove student publications' staff members for publishing what the administration considers embarrassing articles (*Murray v. Board of Trustees of the University of Louisville*; and *Schiff v. Williams*). (Avery & Simpson, 1987, Page 8-9, Ingelhart, 1986, Page 35-36, 51).
- Have prevented a state supported institution of higher learning from imposing prior restraint upon anything appearing in a student publication (*American Civil Liberties Union of Virginia, Inc., v. Radford College*; *Avins v. Rutgers*; *Joyner v. Whiting*; *Nitzberg v. Parks*). (Avery & Simpson, 1987, Page 3, 9-10,15, 49, 52-53; Cross, 1974, Page 297-302; Ingelhart, 1986, Page 32, 34-37; Kail, 1973, Page 11791191; Stevens & Webster, 1973, Page 69-70; Walden, 1985, Page 616, 618).
- Ruled publicly funded college or university officials cannot restrict the distribution of any recognized student publication (*Channing Club v. Board of Regents of Texas Tech University*; *Howe v. University of Florida*; *Johnson et al. v. Brinson et al*; *Solid Rock Foundation v. Ohio State University*; *Spartacus Youth League v. Board of Trustees of Illinois Industrial University*). (Avery & Simpson, 1987, Page 18-19, 24; Ingelhart, 1986, Page 37, 39-40, 88,100; Stevens & Webster, 1973, Page 16-17).
- Stated that it is unconstitutional to withdraw financial support of a student newspaper after it has been officially recognized by a pub-

licly supported college or university (Antonelli v. Hammond; Joyner v. Whiting; Kaina v. Fordham; Stanley v. Magrath; and Veed v. Schwartzkoft). (Avery & Simpson, 1987, Page 9-10, 15, 53; Barron, 1973, Page 4041; Cross, 1974, Page 297-302; Ingelhart, 1987, Page 33- 37,190; Kail, 1973, Page 1179-1191; Stevens & Webster, 1973, Page 12, 55; Walden, 1985, Page 616-618,623-624).

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The latest extensive scholarly work in this area is Dr. Ivan Holmes' 1986 case study report, *Censorship of the Campus Press: A Study of 18 University Newspapers*. Holmes, an associate journalism professor at the University of Arkansas, surveyed 337 American publicly supported university newspapers regarding collegiate press censorship in 1985. He received valid responses from 129 newspaper advisers and 98 student editors, a return rate of 67.3 percent. He then selected 18 student newspapers for inclusion into his report during the summer of 1986. Holmes found:

The censorship dragon is alive and well on university campuses throughout the United States — so much so, in fact, that it could threaten the training of today's news-editorial majors working in the campus press (Holmes, 1986, Page 1).

Holmes found that university presidents, vice presidents, deans, department chairmen, student government officials and others within the administration initiated overt or covert censorship policies upon the institution's student newspaper and staff members. The most shocking finding was that five newspaper advisers, 28 percent of those studied, had actually imposed prior restraint and censorship upon the student publications and staff members. These advisers thus took the leading role in violating the students' First Amendment's guarantees of a free press, and their freedoms of speech and expression (Holmes, 1986, Page 3-34).

His study revealed that there was an extremely active movement within American academia to impose censorship upon student publications and staff members, using three methods. First, administrators had threaten to or actually had cut funding support of student publications even though the American judicial system has repeatedly ruled this unconstitutional. Second, university presidents were actively reorganizing student publications' governing committees and appointing administration-friendly members. These new committee members prepared new bylaws which gave the president the power to change student newspapers' constitutions thus gaining direct control over the publication's editorial content and editor selection process. Third, university presidents circumvented the institution's established employment policies by hiring administration-friendly advisers without organizing a search committee to make recommendation as to whom to hire as the best qualified person for the job. Presidents had also rejected search committee recommendations and hired advisers with little if any prior journalism experience. This employment practice ensured the president gained direct control over the student publication's editorial policies and content because the new adviser was beholding to the president (Holmes, 1986, Page 2-34).

It was necessary to discuss Holmes' 1986 findings because a review of the recent literature, 1987 to 1992, revealed the same things he found have occurred at other institutions of higher learning. Only a limited number of publications have documented recent collegiate press censorship attempts over the past six years. An examination of the current literature also revealed that there is no existing publication which has consolidated this information into one volume, nor has any scholarly work been published on the topic since 1986. This severe lack

of information denies those experiencing similar situations from learning what they can do to protect their guaranteed First Amendment rights.

This paper fills an existing gap in the literature. It provides today's and tomorrow's college and university students with useful information to help prevent them from experiencing the imposition of censorship upon their student newspapers. This information is helpful because censorship of the student press is not a component of an undergraduate's course of study, nor is it a part of a graduate student's academic requirements to complete a masters degree.

DISCUSSION OF RECENTLY IMPOSED COLLEGIATE PRESS CENSORSHIP

Censorship has been imposed upon university student newspapers throughout America despite the aforementioned American federal judiciary rulings. Imposition of overt and covert censorship policies at America's state-supported universities have not been confined to one particular geographical location or restricted to small institutions of higher learning. Tables 1 and 2 reflect student newspapers victimized by collegiate censorship policies at some of America's largest publicly supported universities during the 1980s and 1990s and at much smaller and lesser known state-supported universities.

TABLE 1

University	1992 Enrollment	University	1992 Enrollment
Ball State *p.16-18	20,488	Nebraska	
California State at Northridge	30,441	at Lincoln	24,620
Cincinnati *p.15	18,398	Ohio State	54,313
Delaware*p.19	17,323	Syracuse	15,960
Illinois State*p.11	22,361	Texas as Austin	49,962
Missouri		UCLA	36,366
at Columbia	24,660	UNLV	19,504

*Holmes: 1986

Enrollment figures: Peterson's 1993 Guide to Four-Year Colleges

TABLE 2

University	1992 Enrollment	University	1992 Enrollment
Central Arkansas*	9,057	Pan American*	Not Available
Central Oklahoma State*	15,014	Pittsburg State*	6,166
East Central Oklahoma State*	4,388	New York, Brockport	8,114
Humboldt State*	7,823	Shawnee State	3,341
Montana*	10,788	Southern Colorado*	4,338
Northeastern, Ill*	11,274	Tennessee Chattanooga*	7,888
Northern Oklahoma State*	9,198	Western Kentucky	15,767
Northern Arizona*	17,698		

*Holmes: 1986

Enrollment figures: Peterson's 1993 Guide to Four-Year Colleges.

Administration-sponsored censorship policies have been instituted by those refusing to accept the fact that bad news occurs on their campuses. There are those within academia who actually believe imposing overt or covert censorship policies upon the collegiate press will prevent publication of negative or damaging news stories or commentaries related to events occurring within their campus. For example:

Bruce Carton's cartoon depicting a chicken's admission to UCLA, as a result of the school's affirmative action plan, angered some campus minorities and the student government. UCLA's Associated Students Commission Board, which oversaw the student publication, suspended two editors for publishing the cartoon on the grounds that the newspaper was racially insensitive. These suspensions were revoked the next day, but the cartoon created trouble for another student journalist.

James Toranto, The Daily Sundial's news editor at California State University at Northridge, published a commentary which included a copy of the "offensive" cartoon a week after the UCLA editors' suspensions. He stated the cartoon symbolized a political issue, not a racist one. The paper's publisher, Cynthia Z. Rawitch, suspended Toranto for two weeks without pay a few days after his commentary was published because he had violated "a long-established Sundial policy." The policy stated editors must check with the publisher to ensure controversial articles did not have a negative impact on the paper's legal standing or its reputation (Hirschorn, 1987, Page 35-37).

Toranto filed a grievance against Rawitch's suspension, but the institution's administration rejected it. He contacted the American Civil Liberties Union who took his case and sued the school for violating his constitutionally protected freedoms of speech and expression. Both sides reached an out-of-court settlement. The university agreed Toranto should receive the \$93 in back pay it had withheld during his suspension and to remove the suspension from his college record. The administration also agreed to change its policy about publishing controversial articles and designated the paper a "public forum." The new agreement stated the paper would publish all controversial articles unless they were libelous, obscene or invaded someone's privacy (Stein, 22 July 1989, Page 28).

The University of Missouri's Maneater's managing editor, Stephen Brundage, said the administration attempted to impose censorship on the staff by replacing a joint faculty-student editorial board with an administration controlled committee. He argued that the

administration wanted to make the change because it felt the paper was not providing adequate coverage of campus events. The Director of the Office of Student Development, Suzanne Hollard, said the paper:

Was making a mountain out of mole hill. We didn't say they had to cover homecoming and parents' weekend. We think the Maneater is a paper, and there is nothing wrong with criticizing it (Wolper, 5 December 1987:18).

Barbara Burlisu, the non-faculty newspaper adviser, said establishing a new committee would be dangerous and believed the administration should retain the present student-faculty committee. Holland said the newspaper's staff were the ones who wanted the new committee organized so the administration could help critique the paper (Wolper, 5 December 1987, Page 18-19).

Western Kentucky University found itself in the midst of a full-fledged First Amendment fight between president Kern Alexander and the student newspaper in 1988. During a March 15, 1988 meeting with a faculty advisory committee, Alexander stated he wanted The College Heights Herald to be published by faculty editors, not students. The journalism faculty and students said this was a blatant attempt by Alexander to take editorial control of the paper. Alexander also wanted to expand the newspaper's four member advisory committee that selected the newspaper's editors. It was Alexander's desire to have the student government president, Tim Todd, make all of these appointments even though Todd had been at odds with the newspaper's staff for over a year. Editor Carlo Harris said Alexander wanted to silence the paper because it had published several critical articles about his administration.

Alexander addressed 200 student protesters who had marched against his attempt to impose his will upon the paper. He told the protesters that he firmly supported the First Amendment's protection of a free student press. Later the same day, during an interview with a public radio station, Alexander shifted the blame for the conflict between himself and the paper from the student staff members to the journalism faculty. He said:

Those professors who do not want to submit a budget or a financial plan have caused the problem, and that my main concern with the newspaper was its fiscal accountability, not its editorial content (Wolper, 1988, Page 12).

The paper's adviser, Robert Adams said,

One of the implications of what he said is that we never had any budgetary controls. By saying that we need some kind of fiscal responsibility is an implication that you have fiscal irresponsibilities now which is not the truth (Wolper, 1988, Page 12).

Alexander found himself constantly defending his censorship attempts of the student newspaper. He repeatedly demanded that a five person committee be approved so it could make suggestions to reorganize the student publications board and force the newspaper's editorial content to be more administration-friendly. WKU's Dean of Student Life Howard Bailly said the paper was too independent from the university's structure. He also said:

I believe that there should be an advisory committee to the paper that would give it a broader perspective (Wolper, 1988, Page 13).

Paul McMasters, chairman of the Professional Society of Journalists' National Freedom

of Information Committee stated a three person panel revealed Alexander was the problem at WKU, not the paper or the journalism faculty members. McMasters said:

We will continue to monitor the problem. We think severe short-term damage has been done to the reputation of the Journalism School (Wolper, 1988, pp. 11-13).

The *Generally Speaking* was a highly successful two-year Georgia university student newspaper at Barnsville after being established in 1987. The paper was funded by \$45,000 allocated from a \$500,000 grant which was to be used to develop courses that would attract students to the new campus. The administration spent almost \$22,000 of the \$45,000 to purchase Macintosh computers and to establish a journalism program. The paper became a viable course, winning five Georgia College Press Association awards during its first year of publication. President Jerry Williamson closed the paper in the spring of 1989 when he refused to provide the journalism program with the remaining \$23,000 allocated from the half million dollar grant. Williamson said the paper was no longer practical to continue even though the school's journalism program had 20 journalism majors enrolled.

Williamson transferred the computers to the school's public relations office to prepare the school's advertising brochures previously produced by the school's printing office. Many faculty members filed grievances with the school's board of regents against Williamson for closing the paper. But the board voted to extend Williamson's contract even though the board's own office review team had recommended against the contract extension.

Dean James Richards said the equipment was not being used for formal instruction, but students and faculty had access "to the machines." He also said:

If the goal of the grant was totally for education, obviously that goal isn't being met (Smith, 1990, p. 72).

Faculty members stated the reason Williamson shut down the paper was because it had published stories exposing real problems at the college which Williamson repeatedly refused to address (Smith, 1990, pp. 60, 72).

The State University of New York at Brockport's student government President Chris Nicholas and the student newspaper, *The Stylus*, became involved in a nasty First Amendment fight after the student government's April 7, 1990 meeting. The student government had approved the paper's \$8,700 additional funding request during this meeting. The additional funds were needed to continue publication because some former editors had exhausted the paper's operating budget when they added more color and pages to each weekly issue.

Nicholas went to the paper's office after the meeting and told the staff he would veto the additional funding if they did not support him in an upcoming election. The staff told Nicholas their journalism code of ethics prevented them from making that kind of promise just to satisfy someone possessing the power of the purse. Nicholas vetoed the additional funding request the next day. He said the basis for his veto was that the paper had expanded its operation without his prior approval and that it was \$591 in debt. (The debt was created by an established university policy which prevented student organizations from reimbursing the paper for publishing their advertisements until the end of the current semester.)

The staff ran a story and an editorial, the next week, about Nicholas' threats. Nicholas responded by stating he was closing the paper because it had no funds to continue publication because of fiscal mismanagement. He also withdrew the paper's funding support for the next academic year. Nicholas wrote a letter to the paper stating *The Stylus* had violated established fiscal procedures because the staff had published a special student government elections issue and a regular issue the same week. He said, because of this violation, he was removing the

paper from the school's insurance policy even though he did not have the authority to do so.

The paper did not publish a regular issue the next week, but this did not stop the staff from telling their readership why a regular weekly issue had not been published. St. John Fisher College's student newspaper, *The Pioneer*, located a few miles from the Brockport campus, published a free, four page, 1,500 copy special issue for the Brockport student journalists under another name. Because of Nicholas' censorship attempts, the paper contacted and received help from the local American Civil Liberties Union's chapter to fight their First Amendment battle against the student government. The ACLU represented the paper's staff at the student government's April 30, 1990 meeting. As a result of the ACLU's help, the student government association voted 7 to 3 to continue funding the paper and took measures to prevent Nicholas and future student government officials from imposing censorship upon the paper (Gersh, 1990, Page 26-27).

Conservative students at the University of Texas at Austin attempted to stop publication of *The Tejas*, a little known Hispanic student newspaper in the spring of 1990. The paper had published an editorial calling for the forced resignation of Joseph M. Horn because he had repeatedly spoken out against the university's affirmative action programs. Horn was the assistant dean in the College of Liberal Arts and the faculty adviser to the Young Conservatives of Texas' student organization. Members of this student organization tried to take control of the small paper by enrolling in the classes which published the paper. This attempt failed when the paper's adviser learned the real reason why so many white students had enrolled in the newspaper's courses.

However, the student organization was able to suspend publication of the newspaper when its membership were able to convince the communications college that it was in the school's best interest to withdraw the paper's \$2,200 budget. A spokesperson for the college said that the money allocated to the paper was solely intended to support a class activity, not the distribution of a newspaper. The college stated that only the newspaper's 50 enrolled students and the journalism faculty members should receive copies of the paper. The college also stated that if the students wanted to circulate their paper, they had to solicit private funding to do so (Mangan, 1990, p. A25, A26).

Syracuse University's student newspaper, *The Daily Orange*, refused to accept any funding previously provided by student fees in the fall of 1991. The decision was made after the student government association threatened to withhold the paper's funding, which had been approved by 78 percent of the student body in a referendum, as a means of controlling the paper's editorial content. The SGA demanded the editors strictly adhere to the SGA's publishing guidelines. Required the paper to file a copy of its budget reports with the SGA. And attempted to force the paper to sign a contract with the SGA before receiving any of the approved funding.

The newspaper refused to accept these demands and declared itself completely independent from the university. Editor Jodi Lamagna said the paper would use its advertising revenues to continue publication and would return all subscription fees, about \$80,000, after the money had been equally divided among other student groups and organizations (Editor and Publisher, 18 January 1992, p. 39).

The Open Air, Shawnee State University's student newspaper suspended publication for one month on October 18, 1991. The suspension resulted after the paper's newly appointed adviser, James Flavin, filed an academic plagiarism charge against editor Alice Kimbler. Flavin accused Kimbler of plagiarism after she published an editorial supporting a local referendum which appeared on the November 1991 ballot in Portsmouth, Ohio. Flavin tried to have the administration remove Kimbler even though the paper's publishing handbook clearly stated only the paper's staff had this authority. Flavin resigned after the entire staff voted to retain Kimbler. Tom Davidson was appointed to investigate Flavin's plagiarism charge. He appointed an outside, three person panel of journalism experts to

determine if Kimbler was guilty of plagiarism. The panel said the editorial could not be considered plagiarism because the information had been given to Kimbler to use as she saw fit after the words had been "thrown into the public domain." As a result of the panel's findings, Davidson dismissed the plagiarism charge, but the story did not end there.

Vice President of Student Affairs Richard R. Howard sent the newspaper's staff a memorandum on January 2, 1992. Howard's memo stated:

The administration remained firmly committed to supporting student First Amendment rights and would attempt to maintain the maximum reasonable autonomy for the operation of The Open Air.

The memo also said the university had to ensure the paper properly managed the funds it received from the student government association. Howard told the staff an Ad Hoc committee was being formed to review the paper's publishing guidelines and that the committee had been charged with the responsibility of making recommended changes to the paper's publishing policies.

Howard's memo stated, "An interim faculty adviser" would be appointed with the power to:

... review all copy before the paper goes to press. This review is to ensure that articles are not libelous or obscene and are within legal bounds.

Howard said the adviser must obtain legal opinions regarding what he viewed as questionable articles to ensure they were within legal bounds. His memo also stated the adviser had the power to demand articles be rewritten if he did not like their contents and he could reject them for publication if his changes were not made. (The interim adviser was the institution's public relations director, creating a severe conflict of interest issue.)

Kimble received a three page FAX from the Student Press Law Center regarding these overt censorship attempts by the administration on January 3, 1992. Legal Fellow Mike Hiestand told her Howard's attempts to impose censorship on The Open Air:

... was clearly unconstitutional as an infringement of your First Amendment rights." He said, "No reputable college newspaper in the country operates under the system your publications committee is considering.

Hiestand informed Kimbler that if the university continued to pursue these censorship attempts it would make itself a defendant in a First Amendment lawsuit. He said, "The Student Press Law Center would gladly consult its Attorney Referral Network to help her find free legal representation to pursue this matter in court." Hiestand requested Kimbler present the FAX to the administration with the recommendation they forego the idea of developing the publishing oversight committee or else she would see them in court. Hiestand's FAX stated that the university would lose a censorship legal battle because of the numerous legal precedents which had been set by the American federal judiciary regarding freedom of the collegiate press. (The Open Air, 1991: 25 Nov.; 1992: 7, 21, and 27 January; Howard memo, 1992, 2 Jan.; SPLC FAX, 1992, 3 Jan.)

Three editors recently resigned and seven more were fired at The Ohio State University student newspaper, The Lantern. These resignations and forced removals occurred after the school's journalism faculty issued a policy statement stating the paper's adviser had the authority to review articles for libel before publication. Assistant professor of journalism Kevin Stover stated that the university had to "protect itself from potential libel suits" and said this was the basis for the faculty's decision to give the paper's adviser the right to review the

paper's content prior to publication. He also stated that the students did not possess sufficient knowledge about what constituted libelous words or how to prevent factual incorrections from entering into their articles. This statement causes one to wonder what The Ohio State University journalism faculty teaches their students in a classroom environment.

The Lantern's former editors presented their views on the imposition of prior restraint upon the student newspaper's contents before their departure in a page 1 editorial by stating:

We fear that this policy of prior review may trigger a landslide. Today, a story is killed because it is libelous. Tomorrow, a story is killed because it may be libelous. Down the road, a story is killed because it shows the negative side of the trustees.

Some of the former editors formed an underground newspaper, The Independent, published off-campus, entirely funded by staff generated advertising revenues.

The turmoil was not created because of the uncertainty that someone might file a libel suit for anything published in The Lantern. It was a direct result of the journalism faculty's desire to change the role of the newspaper's adviser prior to the hiring of a new one (Dodge, 1992, Page A35-A36).

CONCLUSIONS

Combining the recent collegiate press censorship incidents presented in this paper with those reflected in Holmes' 1986 case study report, reflects that a pattern of silencing those opposed to the status quo within American academia still exists. Student journalists have experienced institutionalized suppression of their First Amendment rights since 1986 even though the United States Federal judiciary has repeatedly held that these actions are unconstitutional. This leads one to ask the question, "Why has American academia instituted unconstitutional policies upon the student press?"

One answer could be that many people fail to realize that an institution of higher learning is actually its own city. The institution's boards of regents or trustees act much the same as those elected to a city council. They are charged with the responsibility of ensuring the institution continues to function as a place where the American ideals of higher education flourishes. Whereas a city council has the responsibility to ensure that the city functions and that city government fulfills its role in meeting the needs of the citizenry. The role of the president of an institution of higher learning can be successfully compared to a city manager.

The institution's board of regents or trustees hires the president just as the city council hires a city manager. The institution's president and the city's manager are responsible to maintain the orderly day-to-day operations of the institution or the city. The institution's vice president, and others within the administration have the responsibility to assist the president in fulfilling his or her required duties much as those the city manager appoints as department heads and assistants for the various branches of city government. Both the institution and the city have police forces to enforce laws, and protect people from those who would live outside those laws. And like any incorporated municipality serviced by a local newspaper, the student press fulfills its inherent responsibilities of the Fourth Estate to provide people with information they need to know.

Whether administrators at institutions of higher learning like it or not, as with any incorporated community, newsworthy events which directly or indirectly impact the lives of the institution's citizens occur every day. It is the student press' responsibility to inform its readership of these events and more, even if they embarrass the institution. Active collegiate censorship agendas suppresses truthful information from becoming public knowledge. Thusly, every member of that community is denied the right to know what is happening within their community.

Another answer could be that there are those who think they must protect their institution's reputation by imposing censorship upon the student press to suppress publication of articles they consider not to be in their nor their institution's best interest. Why? Exposing the truth about what really goes on within American academia severely damages the school's expensive public relations campaigns that cost millions of dollars to create. There are college and university officials who believe that bad news will drive students from their campus. If fewer students attend a particular institution of higher learning, the federal government will reduce the institution's subsidies which could force an institution to reduce its annual operating budget.

Collegiate press censorship can also be considered as a budgetary item. Silencing those desiring to present newsworthy information to an academic community will ensure that federal dollars will keep rolling in. As long as the federal government keeps pouring money into higher education, the status quo will continue without being challenged by the economic reality of today's American society.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

Serjit Kasior (PhD., Bowling Green State University) is Associate Professor of Journalism & Graduate Coordinator at Morehead State University Morehead, KY 40351.

Ed Darrag (B.A., Morehead State University) is a reporter for Morehead News, Morehead, KY 40351.

COURT CASES

American Civil Liberties Union of Virginia, Inc. v. Radford College. 315 F.Supp. 893 United States District Court W. D. Virginia, Roanoke Division, 1970.

Antonelli v. Hammond. 308 F.Supp. 1329, 1335, United States District Court, D. Massachusetts, 1970.

Arrington v. Taylor. 380 F.Supp. 1350 United States District Court, W. D. Virginia, Roanoke Division, 1972.

Associates & Aldrich Co. v. Times-Mirror Co. 440 F. 2d 133 United States Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit, 1973.

Aumiller v. University of Delaware. 434 F.Supp. 1273 United States District Court D. Delaware, 1977.

Avins v. Rutgers. 385 F. 2d 151 United States Court of Appeals, Third Circuit, (1967) cert. denied 88 S.Ct. 855, 390 U.S. 920 United States Supreme Court, 1967.

Avis v. Rutgers. 385 F. 2d 151, 153-154 United States Court of Appeals, Third Circuit, (1967). cert. denied. 390 U.S. 920 United States Supreme Court, 1968.

Bazaar v. Fortune. 476 F. 2d. 474, 578-581. F. 2d 225 United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, (1974) cert. denied 94 S.Ct. 2409, 416 US 985, United State Supreme Court 1974.

Bistrick v. University of South Carolina. 341 F.Supp. 226 United States District Court, D. South Carolina, Columbia Division, 1971.

Channing Club v. Board of Regents of Texas Tech University. 317 F.Supp. 688 United States District Court, N. D. Texas, Lubbock Division, 1970.

Dickey v. Alabama State Board of Education. 273 F.Supp. 613 United States District Court, M.D. Alabama N.D., 1967.

Healy v. James. 311 F.Supp. 1275 United States District Court, D., Connecticut, (1970) reversed and remanded 93 S.Ct. 2338, 408 U.S. 169 United States Supreme Court, 1972.

Herman v. University of South Carolina. 341 F.Supp. 226 United States District Court D. South Carolina, Columbia Division, (1971) affirmed 457 F. 457 F. 2nd 909 United States Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit, 1972.

- Howe v. University of Florida. Unreported. See Civil Action 78-0035 United States District Court, N.D. Florida, 1970.
- Johnson et al. v. Brinson et al. Civil Action No 78-1001 United States District Court, W. D. Arkansas, El Dorado Division, 1981.
- Jervey v. Martin. 336 F.Suppl. 1350 United States District Court, W. D. Virginia, Roanoke Division, 1972.
- Joyner v. Whiting. 477 F. 2d. 460 United States Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit, 1973.
- Kaina v. Fordham. 702 F. 2d 475, 480, United States Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit, 1983.
- Lee v. Board of State Colleges. 306 F.Suppl. 1097, 1100-1101 United States District Court, Wisconsin (1969) affirmed 411 F. 2nd 1257 United States Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit, 1971.
- Milliner v. Turner. 436 F. 2d 1300, United States Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit, 1983.
- Murray v. Board of Trustees of the University of Louisville. 659 F. 2d 77 United States Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit, 1981.
- Nitzberg v. Parks. 525 F. 2d 378 United States Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit, 1975.
- Papish v. University of Missouri Board of Curators. 93 S.Ct. 1197, 410 U.S. 667 United States Supreme Court, 1973.
- Pickings v. Bruce. 430 F. 2d 595 United States Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit, 1969.
- Saunders v. Virginia Polytechnic Institute. 417 F.2d 1127 United States Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit, 1969.
- Schiff v. Williams. 519 F. 2d 257 United States Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit, 1975.
- Sill v. Pennsylvania State University. 318 F.Suppl. 608 United States District Court, M.D. Pennsylvania, (1970) affirmed 462 F.2d 463 United States Court of Appeals, Third Circuit, 1972.
- Solid Rock Foundation v. Ohio State University. 478 F.Suppl. 96 United States District Court, S.D. Ohio, 1970.
- Spartacus Youth League v. Board of Trustees of Illinois Industrial University. 502 F.Suppl. 789, United States District Court, N.D. Illinois, 1980.
- Stanley v. Magrath. 419 F. 2d 279-280, United States Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit, 1983.-
- Tinker v. Des Moines Independent School District. 89 S.Ct. 733, 393 U.S. 50. United States Supreme Court, 1969.
- Trotman v. Board of Trustees University of Nebraska, Lincoln. 635 F. 2d 216, 986 United States Supreme Court, 1981.
- Trujillo v. Love. 322 F.Suppl. 1266 United States District Court D, Colorado, 1971.
- Veed v. Schwartzkoft. 353 F.Suppl. 149 United States District Court, D. Nebraska, (1973) affirmed 478 F. 2nd 1407 United States Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit Court, (1973) cert. denied 94 S.Ct. 878, 414 U.S. 1135 United States Supreme Court, 1973.

WORKS CITED

- Avery, K. B. & R. J. Simpson. (1987). "The Constitution and Student Publications: A Comprehensive Approach." *Journal of Law & Education*, 16, 1-6.
- Barron, J. A. *Freedom of the Press for Whom? The Right of Access to Mass Media*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- "Charges against editor dismissed as 'unfounded.'" (1992). *The Open Air*, 1.
- "Closure of Second Street Important to SSU." (1991). *The Open Air*, 2.
- Cross, Charles F. (1974). "Withdrawal of Funds for College Newspaper Advocating Segregation Policy Deemed Violation of First and Fourteenth Amendments." *University of Richmond Law Review*, 8, 297-302.
- Daily, Jay E. (1973). *The Anatomy of Censorship*. New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc.

- Dodge, Susan. (1992). Students Fight Administrators and Each Other for Editorial Control of Campus Newspaper. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, A35-A36.
- Gersh, Debra. (1990). Student Newspaper Wins Battle Against Student Government. *Editor and Publisher*, 123, 26-27.
- Hirschorn, Michael W. (1987). University Efforts to Censor Newspapers Are on the Increase Student Editors Say. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 33, A35-A37.
- Holmes, Ivan. (1986). *Censorship of the Campus Press: A Study of 18 University Newspapers*. The Gannett Foundation.
- Ingelhart, Louis E. (1986). *Freedom for the College Student Press*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Kail, Richard E. (1973). Withdrawal of Funding of Campus Newspapers. *Wisconsin Law Review*, 1779-1193.
- Mangan, Katherin S. (1990). Newspaper Published by Hispanic Students at U of Texas Is at Center of Controversy after Challenges by Conservatives. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, A25-A26.
- Open Air resumes publication. (1991). *The Open Air*. 6, 25.
- Peterson's Guide to Four-Year Colleges. (1993). Susan W. Dilts. (Ed.) Princeton, NJ: Peterson's Guide.
- Policies follow professional standards. (1992). *The Open Air*. 6, 3.
- Ryan, Michael and David L. Martison. (1986). Attitudes of College Newspaper Advisers Toward Censorship of the Student Press. *Journalism Quarterly*, 63, 55-60.
- Smith, Michael R. (1990). Computer Censorship on a College Campus. *Editor and Publisher*, 123, 60, 72.
- SPLC FAX. (Jan 3, 1992). *Student Press Law Center*.
- Stein, M. L. (1989). University Student Editor Settles Censorship Dispute. *Editor and Publisher*, 122, 28.
- Stevens, George E. and John B. Webster. (1973). *Law and the Student Press*. Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State University Press.
- Student Newspaper Staff Memo. (1992). Richard R. Howard, Vice President of Student Affairs, Shawnee State University.
- Student paper refuses funds. (1992). *Editor and Publisher*. 125, 39.
- Walden, Ruth. (1985). Editorial Rights, Constitutional Restraints of Editors of State-Supported Newspapers. *Journalism Quarterly*, 62, 616-624.
- Wolper, Allan. (1987). Censorship Issue Raised at University of Missouri. *Editor and Publisher*. 120, 18,19.
- Wolper, Allan. (1988). Campus Censorship Charges. *Editor and Publisher*, 121, 11-13.