F ₁ ,	 I	• R . •	Εı	

0	0, 0 ,0	····	
T ,⊠F	0 <u>8</u> . <u>-</u>	- <u>,</u> <u>N</u>	

Ģ	
· 3 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
, Ŋ, ● , Ŋ, _	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
/ •;	i
, <u>1</u> 877	
	i
, 23 /	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
- · ·	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	_
	-,
1 d - a ² a ²	
بر المراجع الم المراجع المراجع ا	
	• •
- ly car	
and a second	
y	
······································	
sun "nx	,
	,,
N	•

of the Division of Liberal Arts, ordered Erin Latona, Communications Department Chair, to make sure the cartoon was removed. When Laird returned from working at the college's Writing Center that day, he found that the cartoon had been removed. Later that day, Laird complained to

your concern for offending Christian students on campus will translate into concern for all religious beliefs present, and you will prove that diversity is alive and well at Temple College.

In response, Smith e-mailed Kennair later that day without responding to the charge of a double standard on campus. Smith's e-mail suggested, falsely, that Laird's personal expression on his own office door amounted to an official endorsement of religion by the college:

Temple College as a public institution cannot be represented as showing preference toward any religious philosophy/perspective or toward the opposite, being atheism. The same practice goes for politics.

Worse still, Smith argued that "offensive" and "controversial" speech is not protected at Temple College:

The decision to have the quote removed was that the quote can be considered very controversial and offensive to others. In fact, other people have already expressed that the wording is offensive!

Finally, as paraphrased by Scott Jaschik in a November 4 *Inside Higher Ed* article (http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2008/11/04/nietzsche), Smith clarified official Temple policy on the matter: "if someone complains about a specific quote—as someone did about the Nietzsche quote—the person would be asked to remove it."

Temple's policy and its application to Professor Laird are deeply troubling for several reasons. First, as you well know, Temple College is a public college and thus has a binding legal obligation to ensure the First Amendment rights of its faculty. Academic freedom, in addition to freedom of expression, is *not* limited to the classroom alone. The Supreme Court has held that academic freedom is a "special concern of the First Amendment" and that "[are nowhere close to the standard of serious

Temple must immediately inform Laird that he remains free to post materials on his office door and that he faces no punishment whatsoever for doing so or for challenging his unconstitutional treatment. Temple must immediately abandon its policy of responding to complaints with censorship. Further, Temple must ensure that no policy or contrivance is used to deny Laird further employment because of the exercise of his rights or because of any real or potential embarrassment caused by public attention to his case.

Please spare Temple College the embarrassment of fighting against the Bill of Rights, by which it is legally and morally bound. We

and Udan le