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ACADEMIC FREEDOM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE: THE MCCARTHY ERA

MILTON M. KLEIN

Academic freedom, or the right to teach, research, and publish in their fields of scholarship without fear of outside political, economic, or religious pressure, is the most highly valued privilege of those who constitute the faculties of American colleges and universities. Tradition has given the privilege widespread legitimacy except in authoritarian societies, but even in democratic governments, academic freedom has often been challenged by those who consider it a license to teach "subversive" or "disloyal" doctrines. The most serious attack on academic freedom in the United States occurred during the early 1950s in what has been called the McCarthy Era.

As chairman of a U.S. Senate subcommittee, McCarthy investigated and "exposed" a variety of individuals in government, education, the arts, the churches, and the military whom he considered Communists or Communist sympathizers, but other congressional committees and numerous private watchdog organizations joined in the effort. These investigations produced major controversies on the campuses of the Universities of California, Wisconsin, and Colorado, Cornell University, and the City College of New York, but the University of Tennessee was not immune to the hysteria that gripped the nation in the 1950s.

A foretaste of these attacks occurred as early as 1923, when seven UT faculty members were dismissed somewhat summarily. Not all were terminated for reasons that raised issues of academic freedom, but there was enough of the atmosphere of McCarthyism to be apprehensive of the future. As chairman of the UT faculty for a decade, Milton M. Klein, professor emeritus of history, helped to avert the worst of McCarthyist excesses. Klein, along with others on the faculty and the administration, helped to ensure that academic freedom would not be disrupted by the attacks of the period.

In 1932 another dismissed professor of education produced a second AAUP complaint. Although the reinstatement of UT chapter members summarily in 1932 caused little, the 1950s would be different.

None of these earlier conflicts between the university and the community, however, would be as devastating as the McCarthy attacks on faculty, administration, and students. The University of Tennessee was not immune to the hysteria that gripped the nation in the 1950s.


The incident is discussed fully in James R. Montgomery, Threshold of a New Day: The University of Tennessee, 1919-1946 (Knoxville, 1971), 19-37.
there was enough of the appearance of such to warrant an investigation by the young American Association of University Professors (AAUP). One of the professors ran into trouble for assigning a history text which included the statement that “We are all descended from lower animals.” Although Tennessee did not pass its anti-evolution law until 1925, public sentiment was already strongly against the teaching of Darwinian evolution before the law was passed. The AAUP undertook an investigation and concluded that UT’s system of one-year faculty appointments was “neither just nor compatible with the dignity of the profession”; that the timing of the dismissals during the summer, when the discharged professors were away and unable to seek alternative employment, was unfair; and that while the administration’s actions may have been legal, they were not equitable or “honorable.” The association at its 1924 meeting declared the dismissals unjustified and criticized conditions at UT as “detrimental to the purposes of the institution and to the interests of higher education in general.”

In 1932 another dismissal—this time of Alfred Mueller, an associate professor of education—for allegedly failing to teach effectively, produced a second AAUP investigation and a renewed charge that tenure at UT was not in keeping with “good academic custom and usage.” The AAUP now placed UT on its censure list, a blacklisting that continued from 1939 until 1947. The AAUP gave no public reasons for the reinstatement of UT to the association’s good graces, but local chapter members surmised that the retirement in 1946 of President James Hoskins, who had been behind the dismissals, and the trustees’ agreement to abide by the AAUP’s 1940 “Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure” were factors in the organization’s actions.

None of these earlier incidents reflected a national pattern of hostility to institutions of higher education. The McCarthy Era of the 1950s would be different in both the virulence and the extent of the attacks on faculty, administrators, and the universities themselves.

---
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Knoxville was no hotbed of “radical” politics and never experienced the intensity of inquisitorial activity from legislative committees, demagogic politicians, or private anti-Communist organizations that characterized other academic centers. Nevertheless, the decade of the 1950s witnessed several forcible efforts to uncover “radicalism” on the UT campus. After all, it was not difficult for anti-Communists to find targets when “subversion,” “disloyalty,” and Communism were defined in very vague ways. A 1954 Army pamphlet entitled *How to Spot a Communist* warned that one could identify Communists by their predisposition to discuss civil rights, social and religious discrimination, or the immigration laws. A naval intelligence officer advised that Communists were most likely to be found among “intelligent people,” and an opinion poll disclosed that the general public believed Communists to be people who talked about world peace, “read too much,” and had “an affinity for causes.”

Senator Joseph McCarthy did not begin his public campaign against subversives until February 9, 1950, when he claimed to have a list of 205 Communists in the State Department, but President Harry Truman’s 1947 executive order instituting a loyalty-security program for all federal civilian employees had already produced what the New York *Times* in 1951 called “a subtle, creeping paralysis of freedom of thought and speech” on university campuses. A mild manifestation of this phenomenon occurred in Knoxville in late 1948, when the Rev. R. O. Eller of the Central Methodist Church denounced Mary Elizabeth Barnicle, a University of Tennessee lecturer in English, for allegedly distributing campaign literature for Henry Wallace among her students. (Wallace, Franklin D. Roosevelt’s third-term vice president, ran for president in 1948 under the Progressive Party label.) Eller also charged that Barnicle was being investigated by the FBI as a Communist. What action the University took is unknown, but Barnicle resigned on August 31, 1950.

Late in that same year, while the Korean War was in progress, an assistant professor of philosophy, Howard Lee Parsons, became the object of a curious accusation by a local patriotic group because of a question he had placed on a logic examination. In the question, he asked students to use their knowledge of formal logical processes to prove” that “the Soviet Regime” and that the U.S.S.R. was “aggressive.” UT Vice President Cleland was only one of six, a few quotations and which of logic they had learned a “small flurry” created much excitement either by Professor Willis in his program, the rest of the was known to be a politician, and it is likely that the active faculty partisan.

A few years later Parsons, because of his membership in the American Civil Rights Union, an organization that he was associated with U.S. Senator’s Internal Affairs Committee, that it was investigating the University, issued a public denial that he remained suspect for the National Association for the Advancement of a critic of American was not a communist. Although he was never his dean that he was. Both the head of his philosophy professor to his recommendations in 1950 was an effective teaching the recipient of numerous students about his no “liability” to the University were based on “heary and views on “sensitive” issues, but they insisted that they held differences of opinion.

---
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"radical" politics and never experienced activity from legislative committees of anti-Communist organizations that others. Nevertheless, the decade of the early 1950s, the decade of the "radicalism" on the difficult for anti-Communists to find "loyalty," and Communism were defined in a pamphlet entitled How to Spot a Communist. The pamphlet accused Communists by their "loyalty," and the general public became more suspicious of anti-Communists. A naval intelligence officer most likely to be found among poll disclosed that the general public people who talked about world war II had an affinity for causes.8

As the campaign against communism began, President Harry Truman's administration created a loyalty-security program for government employees. This program produced what the New York Times called "loyalty paralysis of freedom of thought." A mild manifestation of this paralysis was the case of Dr. Robert R. Church, a lecturer in English, who was accused of being a Communist. Church denied being a Communist, but the university, according to the New York Times, was "loyalty paralyzed" by the fear that he might be a Communist.

The Korean War was in progress, and the U.S. government's loyalty-security program was extended to the University of Tennessee. The university's loyalty-security program was known as "Operation Blacklist."

A few years later, Parsons was again the subject of public controversy because of his membership in the Southern Conference Educational Fund, an organization devoted to advancing racial desegregation. The U.S. Senate's Internal Security Subcommittee had earlier announced that it was investigating the fund for "Communist activities." The fund was defunct, but Parsons remained associated with the fund for several years as a member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), a critic of American foreign policy, and a supporter of liberal causes. Although he was never threatened with dismissal, he was advised by his dean that he would be neither promoted nor advanced in salary. Both the head of his department, Edward Cureton, and the senior philosophy professor in the department, Merritt Moore, wrote strong recommendations in April 1957 for Parsons's promotion, noting that he was an effective teacher, a "recognized and productive scholar," and the recipient of numerous "unsolicited" favorable comments from students about his teaching. As for the allegations that he was a "liability" to the University, his colleagues responded that these charges were based on "hearsay evidence." They conceded that Parsons held views on "sensitive" social and political matters that were controversial, but they insisted that a democratic society should expect "honestly held differences of opinion." Failure to promote Parsons would be
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interpreted as "an infringement on intellectual and academic freedom of a peculiarly insidious type."  

The appeal to Dean Lexemuel Hesler of the College of Liberal Arts fell on deaf ears. Parsons resigned on August 31, 1957. He moved to Coe College in Iowa, where he became head of the department of Philosophy and Religion, and then to the University of Bridgeport as chairman of the Philosophy department. He retired in 1989 after an active career in teaching and scholarly publication.  

In the fall of 1952 another incident occurred on the Knoxville campus that indicated the pervasiveness of national suspicion and fear at American universities. A number of students organized a Film Society and announced that they would show classic and foreign films to student audiences in the Ferris Hall auditorium. Unfortunately, the society's first choices proved to be highly controversial, although neither the students nor their faculty advisers—Samuel Baron, an instructor in history, and Richard Brothers, a music instructor—expected them to be so. The films were four Charlie Chaplin comedy shorts—The Cure, The Floorwalker, The Firemen, and The Pawnshop—and Alexander Nevsky, a Russian epic set in the thirteenth century, directed by the well-known Sergei Eisenstein with music by the equally well-known Sergei Prokofiev.  

The Knoxville Journal launched the attack in a front-page story on October 5. It criticized the University for showing "a Soviet-produced film glorifying Russia" and Chaplin films only months after the movie star had been barred from the U.S. because of "grave moral charges" against him. The Chaplin charges were ten years old in 1952. The fifty-four-year-old comedian had been sued in 1943 by a young woman, Joan Barry, who claimed he was the father of her child. Chaplin denied this charge. A year later the comedian was indicted for violating the Mann Act, which made it a federal crime to transport a woman across state lines for purposes of prostitution. Barry had allegedly received money from Chaplin for interstate travel. Chaplin was acquitted after a trial in April. The paternity suit initiated by Barry led to a mistrial; a second suit held Chaplin guilty, though the jury could not agree on damages. The director of the campus film society, John Duncan, was dismissed from the University and banned from campus events.  

Knoxville's American Legion also held the film in contempt of its by-laws. The Legion filed suit against the University and the University agreed to withdraw the films. The American Legion then withdrew its suit. (This story is told in detail in the article "The Film Society of the University of Tennessee," Knoxville Journal, 14 March 1953.)  

In September 1952 a film named Limelight was released. It was a security risk, according to the American Legion. The Legion thereupon began a campaign to blacklist a local actor as a person who sympathizes with the enemy.  

Knoxville's American Legion and other patriotic groups locally. Early in October, John Duncan, a U.S. Army military commander of the American Legion in Knoxville and University of Tennessee, was protesting the University's refusal to withdraw the films. The Legion accused the University of "contradicting" its Resolution that film societies should "seek out material that is wholesome, free from subversive organization, and representative of American citizenship during the period of peace." The Resolution was sent to President Eisenhower and the Board of Trustees. The University said that future film showings would be "subject to the approval of the lawyer who had drafted the Resolution."  

The day after the trial The Knoxville Journal reported: "The judge said he would rule on the case within a week. The trial had been requested by the defendant, William W. Brhm, assuming the costs of the case. It is alleged in the suit that the University's Film Society is a "Montgomery et al., To Foster Knowledge, 226; Knoxville Journal, 8 February 1954; Merritt H. Moore and Edward E. Careton to Dean L. R. Hesler, 23 April 1957; Historian's Files, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.  
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second suit held Chaplin to be the father even though blood tests showed otherwise.16

In September 1952 Chaplin was in London for the premiere of his film Limelight when the U.S. attorney general announced that the actor was a security risk and should not be allowed to reenter the United States because of his “unsavory character.” The American Legion thereupon began a national boycott of Chaplin films, portraying the actor as a perennial alcoholic, megalomaniac, and Communist sympathizer.17

Knoxville’s American Legion Post No. 2 carried out the attack locally. Early in October the post adopted a resolution introduced by John Duncan, assistant attorney general of Knox County and commander of the Legion’s East Tennessee Division (later mayor of Knoxville and U.S. congressman from Tennessee’s second district), protesting the UT Film Society’s showing of the Chaplin films. The resolution charged that Chaplin was a member of a number of subversive organizations and criticized him for failing to take out U.S. citizenship during his long residence in the country. The resolution, sent to President Clide Brehm and all the members of the University’s Board of Trustees, demanded that the Chaplin films not be shown and that future film showings be screened to insure that they were suitable for student audiences. The Knoxville Journal added its voice of protest, calling the Chaplin films “ludicrous” rather than artistic and protesting the Russian film on the ground that it undoubtedly carried “a good dose of Communist propaganda”—even though the Journal writer had never seen the film.18

The day after the Legion protest President Brehm announced that the films would not be shown. “I’m sorry the matter has come up,” Brehm said in a letter to the local post commander, Charles Siegal.19

The Film Society’s faculty advisers indicated that a Buster Keaton comedy and a Peter Lorre mystery would be substituted for the offending films. Neither faculty adviser commented on the validity of the Legion’s charges.20

Student response was less muted. An editorial in the student newspaper, the Orange and White, blasted the ban on the films as “nonsense” and called the Legion’s and the Journal’s charges “half-
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century Teutonic knights. I just can’t imagine a gullible capitalistist American saying: “[L]et’s have an end to violence.”

The student’s plea was not in the air. It was that of a student (a history instructor who was also a student adviser) who was squarely in the spell of the Red Scare. He ferreted out subversive in the 1930s, when the legislative inquiry of subversion began. Senator Frank C. Cleaver, a southerner, particularly favored the administration of subversion. As an official, he was the most active in pursuing subversion during the period when the administration’s loyalty-security programs were the most active.

Cloide Breckinridge, president of the University of Tennessee, 1946-1959. Courtesy UTK Special Collections.

cocked.” What connection, the paper asked, was there between Chaplin’s private life and the films he made years ago? “Is that the meaning of academic freedom?” A student columnist was even more critical of the ban. He ridiculed the charge that Alexander Nevsky contained Communist propaganda: “It is difficult to believe that there could be any Communist pitch to a movie dealing with thirteenth
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February 1953.
century Teutonic knights, especially since the dialogue is in Russian. . . . I just can’t imagine a sturdy Russian peasant of 1250 vintage cursing ‘the capitalistic American dogs.” The columnist ended with an appeal: “[L]et’s have an end to witch-hunting in Knoxville, shall we?”

The student’s plea went unheeded. Less than six months later, the campus was enmeshed in another controversy, and Sam Baron, the history instructor who had been one of the Film Society’s faculty advisers, was squarely in the middle of it. As legislators in many states fell under the spell of Joe McCarthy’s campaign of fear, they sought to ferret out subversive influences appearing in textbooks. In Tennessee a legislative inquiry of such a nature was launched early in 1953, at the beginning of Frank Clement’s first term as governor. Clement did not particularly favor the investigation, but he found it impossible to oppose it. As an official of the American Legion he had been somewhat active in pursuing subversives, and he had been an FBI agent during the period when the agency was involved in carrying out the Truman loyalty-security program.

Senator Sterling Roberts of Roane County chaired the committee, which had received complaints about sociology and history texts. On February 5, 1953, the committee held a one-day hearing on the UT, Knoxville, campus. Two books appeared to interest the committee, An Introduction to Economics by Theodore Morgan and Russia, A History by Sidney Harcave, although the provers also quizzed the heads of the Sociology, Political Science, and Psychology/Philosophy departments about their texts. Fred Holly, head of the Economics department, was questioned about statements in the Morgan text that referred to income taxes, the inequalities of wealth distribution, the national debt, and socialized medicine. Holly responded that while he did not agree with everything in the text there was no reason for not using it. Students should learn to read textbooks critically, and, in any case, instructors were more important in conveying information to students than texts. The committee’s suspicions were apparently eased by Holly’s statement that the book had been used only in the Extension Division, that it was not complete enough for a full-year course, and that it had already been replaced by another text.

---
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The Harcave book was used in Baron's Russian history courses, a three-term survey from the time of Peter the Great to the Soviet regime. Under questioning, Baron stated that the text was evenly balanced in its treatment of Communism, and that appeared to satisfy the committee. The day's hearings seemed to be the finale of the "Red Scare" on the Knoxville campus. Senator Roberts had intended the investigation to be limited, and he had managed to keep it so. His committee's final report, presented to a joint session of the legislature, concluded that it had uncovered no evidence of Communist material in the state's textbooks. It did urge publishers to produce texts that "present a vigorous, dynamic, and patriotic approach to American democracy and government." As for those used in the state's colleges, the committee expressed its satisfaction that Tennessee's colleges and universities were employing adequate safeguards against "the infiltration of subversive influences" into texts.

When the report was introduced into the legislature, it was spread on the journals of each house by a joint vote of 110 to 6, but without specific endorsement. From the viewpoint of a later historian of Tennessee politics, the investigation had "fizzled like a half-wet firecracker." A student columnist in the Orange and White derided the entire inquiry as an example of the craze for investigating that was characteristic of America's "harried society . . . from Joe McCarthy . . . down to . . . state legislatures." The student warned Americans to be on guard against publicity-seeking politicians who failed to respect the time-honored American principle that "no man has the right to pass laws telling all other men what they may or may not read."

The fireworks, however, had only begun. A local assemblyman, Judd Acuff, bitterly attacked the report of the joint investigating committee as a cover-up. He turned his wrath on Sam Baron, charging that the UT history instructor was a native-born Russian teaching Communism from a Russian textbook. In an oblique reference to the fact that Baron was Jewish, Acuff added: "He's against the Christianity we were taught." As an added fillip to his anti-Communist audience, Acuff claimed that Baron had told his classes that only two things mattered, sex and internationalism.
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Acuff now enlarged the objects of his attack. In addition to at least
two Communists on the UT faculty, he alleged that as many as five
professors made up a club called the “League of Industrial Democracy”
which taught still another foreign “ism” on the campus. Further, he
asserted that History department head J. Wesley Hoffman, on leave
teaching at the 7120th Air Base Group in Wiesbaden, Germany, under
the auspices of the University of Maryland Extension Service, was a
Communist sympathizer who had belittled the U.S. Army, made fun of
democracy, and taught that Moscow should be the world capital.

---

28 Knoxville Journal, 5 March 1953.
The breadth and ludicrousness of Acuff’s charges resulted in some angry responses. Baron issued a point-by-point reply stating that he had been born in New York City, was not a Communist sympathizer, and had never belonged to a League for Industrial Democracy. Further, he asserted that the textbook under attack was the most widely used text in college Russian history courses. (Its author was, in fact, a native-born American with a Ph.D. from the University of Chicago, a professor at the State University of New York, and a former analyst with the Office of Strategic Services and the U.S. State Department. The textbook in question was so popular that it went through six editions by 1968.) UT Vice President Fred Smith said there was no such club as the League for Industrial Democracy on the campus. Two of Baron’s students, one a Korean War veteran and the other a senior social studies major, wrote strong letters of endorsement of his teaching, which they said they never found tinged with any pro-Communist bias.29

Hoffman received a unanimous vote of confidence from the pastor and board of Knoxville’s First Methodist Church, of which he was an active member. They denounced the charges as “vicious, unwarranted and ridiculous.”30 Professor Stanley Folmsbee, acting head of the History department, said he had never found anything in Hoffman’s letters to his friends in the department belittling the army.31 The UT chapter of the AAUP on March 10 passed a resolution expressing “entire confidence” in the loyalty of both Baron and Hoffman.32 James Stokely of Newport, Tennessee, derided Acuff’s charges and in a letter to the News-Sentinel warned that “today our colleges are being investigated and intimidated; tomorrow it may be our newspapers or the sanctity of our homes.”33 The Nashville Tennessean criticized Acuff for his “loose” remarks, defended the investigating committee’s report for its “fairness and honesty,” and denounced Acuff’s supporters for seeking to “undermine confidence in public schools and colleges.”34 A fellow assemblyman accused Acuff of “irresponsible slander” and of having handed UT a “damaging blow.” Senator Roberts defended his committee’s report and decried Acuff’s criticisms: “We felt irreparable

harm could be done without trying to prevent it.”

UT’s administration cautioned that the recommendation of every faculty member, instead of generalities.35 This statement offered Dean L.R. Hesler a chance to make clear that suspicion of his loyalty was not an issue in the summer of 1953.36 He would not be retired on the Chaplin incident that threatened his career as he moved to joining the faculty of the California at San Diego from Chapel Hill, from where he was notified in the fall of 1953 that he would be retained his position. He retired in 1955.

Senator McCarthy, in 1954, by the overreach that produced a beginning of the American professorial conflict. An editorial in the the Tennessean that “We have already too much anger and inflammation. Time magazine confidence in the
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36 The faculty member was Milton Klein, 18.
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Acuff's charges resulted in some day-by-day reply stating that he had a Communist sympathizer, and in industrial Democracy. Further, he was the most widely used text author was, in fact, a native-born University of Chicago, a professor at a former analyst with the Office of the Department. The textbook in through six editions by 1968.) UT was no such club as the League is. Two of Baron's students, one a senior social studies major, his teaching, which they said Communist bias.\textsuperscript{29} of confidence from the pastor at Church, of which he was an charges as "vicious, unwarranted" Polmsbee, acting head of the they found anything in Hoffman's belittling the army.\textsuperscript{31} The UT passed a resolution expressing with Baron and Hoffman.\textsuperscript{32} James Acuff's charges and in a letter today our colleges are being it may be our newspapers or Tennessean criticized Acuff investigating committee's report bounced Acuff's supporters for public schools and colleges."\textsuperscript{34} A "irresponsible slander" and of Senator Roberts defended his criticisms: "We felt irreparable harm could be done to our school system if we launched a witch hunt without trying to prove or disprove charges."\textsuperscript{35}

UT's administration promised to look into Acuff's charges but cautioned that the matter was "delicate," affecting the reputation of every faculty member. The administration must have "positive evidence instead of generalities in dealing with matters of this kind."\textsuperscript{36} While this statement offered some reassurance, faculty morale remained low. Dean L.R. Hesler conceded as much. The anti-Communist hysteria sometimes took curious forms. A newly appointed history instructor was informed in the fall of 1953 to shave off his beard lest it arouse suspicion of his loyalty.\textsuperscript{37} Sam Baron left the University at the end of the summer in 1953, but he had already been advised that his contract would not be renewed. The accusations against him during the Chaplin incident the year before and the textbook charge hurt his career as he moved to various universities on one-year contracts before joining the faculty of Grinnell College in Iowa, then the University of California at San Diego, and finally the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, from which he retired in 1989 as an Alumni Distinguished Professor.\textsuperscript{38} Wesley Hoffman was not affected by Acuff's charges. He retained his position as head of the History department, from which he retired in 1965.

Senator McCarthy's censure by his own colleagues on December 2, 1954, by the overwhelming vote of 67 to 22 ended his influence and produced a beginning to the end of the “Great Fear” that had pervaded the American professoriate. But incalculable damage had been done. An editorial in the Orange and White in May 1953 noted with sorrow that “We have already had first-hand experience here at U-T of just how much anger and injustice can result from inaccurate accusations." A Time magazine survey had disclosed that "professors are losing confidence in their chosen field," and one dean had reported that
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"students were reluctant to discuss controversial subjects." "This is not the American way," the UT student editorial writer concluded.39

Within the next year, positive action was initiated to strengthen academic freedom within the University. A joint committee of faculty representing the local chapter of the AAUP and various colleges on the Knoxville campus drafted a strong statement on faculty rights to freedom of teaching and research on June 30, 1954. President Brehm submitted it on October 26 to the Board of Trustees, which voted to send it to the Martin and Memphis campuses for faculty and administrative review and comments. Memphis proposed a few changes; Martin had none.40 In February 1955 Brehm forwarded the revised statement to the trustees urging approval on the ground that it affirmed the faculty's freedom to teach while providing for disciplining those "who do not conform to the ethics set forth in the policy statement." These ethics included a caution to faculty against expressing views either in or out of the classroom on subjects about which they had no professional competence.41 Brehm elaborated his views a month later in welcoming the national AAUP at its annual meeting, which was held in Gatlinburg and was hosted by the UT chapter. No one wanted to restrict teachers in expressing opinions they were "qualified to discuss with authority," he said, but they must not use the "prestige and dignity" of their position for propaganda purposes or to express views on matters they were not qualified to discuss. He urged teachers to exercise "judgment, discretion and wisdom" in such matters.42

The proposed policy statement evoked some animated discussion among the trustees. One protested that there was too much emphasis on freedom and not enough on responsibility; another feared that the statement would encourage socializing between UT and the city's black Knoxville College faculty! Still another trustee demanded an explicit acknowledgment of UT's obligation to uphold the U.S. and Tennessee Constitutions. A new statement was ultimately drafted by the board, approved by the trustees, and placed on the agenda for a later meeting.

The "Statement on University Policy Regarding Faculty Probationary Tenure" was revised to express "the University's policy with regard to securing and retaining qualified personnel." It declared that all faculty members would be expected to maintain "the highest standards of scholarship and professional competence, to respect the rights of colleagues, and to introduce and conduct courses of instruction and research teaching. Similarely, they would be responsible to the University outside the classroom, and to the community."43

The statement further detailed the process that permitted changes in the draft, and the Joint Committee worked diligently. The Committee for Academic Freedom had raised objections; their obligations to the University, did not require the draft to reduce or require faculty to be scrutinized. Brehm, who had in a joint letter before a faculty ammendment noted, "The University's policy is to keep merely statement of the statement of "action" by the University's policy was to keep merely the statement of policy of those who succeed, not of the action by the University's policy period was specified in the by the University's policy was to keep merely the University's statement of action of those who succeed, not of the action by the University's policy period was specified in the

The trustee's reaction to the base attack on "academic freedom" from a Central Methodist Church speaker at the UT Club prompted the UT Board of Trustees to request "the university to express its position on the matter."45

40 Dean of the School of Biological Sciences Thomas P. Nash to Medical Vice President O.P. Hyman, 1 April 1955; Dean of Martin Branch Paul Meek to President Cloide Brehm, 10 March 1955, UTK Archives.
41 Brehm to the Board of Trustees, 1 February 1955, UTK Archives; "The University of Tennessee Policy Statement Regarding Academic Freedom and Responsibility," 30 June 1954, UTK Archives.
42 Orange and White, 10 March 1955.
approved by the faculty committee that had drafted the original proposal, and adopted on November 4, 1955.\textsuperscript{43}

The "Statement of Principles Governing Freedom, Responsibility, and Tenure" included all the principles governing appointments, probationary periods, the grant of tenure, and terminations of appointments contained in the AAUP's 1940 statement on those subjects. On academic freedom, the board reiterated President Brehm's position that while faculty members were free to discuss their subjects in the classroom and to research and publish within their areas of competence, they should exercise care in expressing personal views or introducing controversial matter unrelated to their subjects into their teaching. Similar discretion should be exercised in speaking or writing outside the classroom lest the University be judged unfairly by such remarks.\textsuperscript{44}

The statement was surprisingly liberal both in its content and in the process that produced it. A faculty committee had written the original draft, and the board's revision was referred back to the faculty committee for approval. The statement, while reminding faculty of their obligations to uphold the constitution and laws of the state and nation, did not demand oaths of loyalty (as some states did at the time) or require faculty to cooperate with legislative or administrative efforts to ferret out subversion in the University (as some university presidents did in a joint statement on March 24, 1955).\textsuperscript{45} With only one amendment in 1971, the trustees' statement has remained the University's policy on academic freedom and tenure. (The 1971 change merely stated that tenure could be attained "only through positive action" by the Board of Trustees, after the appropriate probationary period was served.)\textsuperscript{46}

The trustees' policy was a reassuring safeguard against future broad-based attacks on academic freedom at UT, but it did not prevent critics from engaging in skirmishes. In 1958 Henry Crane, minister of the Central Methodist Church of Detroit, Michigan, was the principal speaker at the Mid-Winter Convocation, an annual event sponsored by the UT Christian Association and two other campus religious organizations. Crane had spoken at the convocation on four previous occasions.

\textsuperscript{43} Jerome G. Taylor to Brehm, 23 February 1955; Harley Fowler to Brehm, 10 February 1955; Vice President Eugene A. Waters to Harley Fowler, 25 April 1955, UTK Archives.

\textsuperscript{44} Brehm to the Board of Trustees, 6 October 1955; UT Board of Trustees Minutes, 4 November 1955, UTK Archives.

\textsuperscript{45} Schrecken, \textit{No Ivory Tower}, 188-89.

\textsuperscript{46} UT Board of Trustees Minutes, 17 June 1971, UTK Archives.
occasions without incident, but this time he was attacked violently by the Knoxville Journal as a Communist sympathizer who had been associated with twenty-seven left-wing movements since 1940. (Three days later the Journal raised the number to fifty-five!) The paper demanded an investigation into the propriety of Crane's appearance on the UT campus.\footnote{Knoxville Journal, 24, 27 January 1958.} Undaunted by the assault, Crane in his address, titled "The Fate We Face," denounced the "so-called Patriots" who threatened democracy by their contempt for free speech. "Democracy thrives on controversy," Crane warned, "but it dies if you try to shut it up."\footnote{Knoxville News-Sentinel, 31 January 1958.}

While the Journal continued to criticize UT for allowing Crane to appear on the campus, there was no administrative response. The only reply was a letter to the Journal from the associate dean of liberal arts, Kenneth Knickerbocker, protesting the effort to smear Crane by his associations with various organizations. "The basic test of freedom," Knickerbocker wrote, "is the freedom to be wrong in one's opinions without being sent to Siberia."\footnote{Knoxville Journal, 30 January 1958.}

Three years later another incident was more disturbing to the trustees. It involved George Soule, an economist who had been appointed visiting professor for the 1961-1962 academic year. The department of Economics was about to embark on a doctoral program and wanted an economist of stature to strengthen the faculty for this purpose. The department was delighted when Soule accepted the invitation to come to Knoxville. Soule, the author of fifteen books, had been recommended by Arthur Burns, president of the National Bureau of Economic Research and formerly chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Dwight Eisenhower. Burns had lauded Soule as an "economist of extraordinary range and ability."\footnote{UT Board of Trustees Minutes, 10 November 1961, UTK Archives.}

A month after his arrival, Soule gave a luncheon address to the Knoxville Economic Club, a group headed by Lewis Sinclair, a black economist at TVA. The Knoxville Journal, in reporting the event, noted that Sinclair was also a director of Knoxville's Highlander Research and Education Center, formerly the Highlander Folk School, located at Monteagle, Tennessee.\footnote{Knoxville Journal, 12 October 1961.} To conservatives, the center was suspect because it brought black and white union members together in workshops that trained organizers and interracial relations.

The editor of the trustee that Soule had taught Fabian Socialists, should not be used to train the free enterprise system publicly in his newspaper to remedy the situation. A pamphlet published by Soule the influence of the KKK and the left-wing in there. Some group that taught Fabian Socialists, in turn, asked Soule for a report. Holly's reputation was charges: Keynes was not a socialist nor was the Center; the National was a director, was highly Soule's writings showed the the American economic reservations about foundation.\footnote{G. R. Smith to Jerome T. Boise, Trustee Minutes.}

President Holt acknowledged of the Board of Trustee evidence coming from the university and the California State University that the purportedly tied Soule with the organizations. Holt is not an economist, he was not concerned. Holt continued so long as the Soule was a Socialist, it might not matter. When asked whether he responded that there

\footnote{Pred Holt to Vice President of Trustee Minutes, 53 UTK Archives.}
he was attacked violently by an inveterate sympathizer who had been involved in campus movements since 1940. (Three weeks later, the same person was arrested for assaulting the campus police.) The paper, The Patriot, was in a state of near collapse. The paper, published weekly by the “so-called Patriots” who ran UT, included an attack on Crane’s appearance on campus. The editor of the paper, an associate dean of liberal arts, accused Crane of being a “Communist” and called for his ouster from the university. The basic test of freedom, he wrote, is the right of the government to overthrow the government if it dies if you try to shut it down.

The trustees of UT were alarmed by the possibility of a campus controversy and decided to take action. They appointed a special committee to investigate the charges. The committee, chaired by President Andrew Holt, consisted of five faculty members, three of whom were appointed by the president. The committee recommended that Crane be suspended without pay for thirty days. The trustees accepted the recommendation.

Twelve hours later, in the midst of the controversy, Crane resigned his position at UT. The trustees accepted his resignation and fired him. The trustees then announced that they would not take any further action against Crane. The trustees also announced that they would not allow the university to be used as a political battleground.

The trustees' decision was hailed by some as a victory for academic freedom. Others, including the presidents of other universities, condemned the trustees' decision as a betrayal of academic freedom. The controversy continued to rage for several days, with protests and counter-protests taking place on campus.

The controversy ended in a settlement. The trustees agreed to allow Crane to return to UT on a part-time basis, and the university paid his salary. The trustees also agreed to establish a committee to study the university's policies on academic freedom.

The controversy had a lasting impact on UT. The university's reputation for academic freedom was damaged, and the university was forced to confront issues of free speech and academic freedom. The controversy also had a political impact, as it contributed to the rise of the conservative movement in the United States.

The trustees' decision to fire Crane was later overturned by the Tennessee Supreme Court. The court ruled that the trustees had acted improperly in firing Crane, and that the university was required to pay him his salary.

The controversy also had a lasting impact on UT's faculty. Many faculty members were united in their support of Crane, and the controversy contributed to the hardening of the faculty's resolve to defend academic freedom. The controversy also contributed to the growth of the campus political consciousness, with students and faculty becoming more involved in political issues.

The controversy also had a lasting impact on the university's budget. The controversy was seen as a drain on the university's resources, and the trustees had to cut back on other programs to pay for Crane's salary.

The controversy also had a lasting impact on UT's student body. The controversy was seen as a way for the university to show its commitment to academic freedom, and many students were proud to be part of a university that defended academic freedom.

The controversy also had a lasting impact on the university's alumni. Many alumni were proud to be part of a university that defended academic freedom, and they contributed to the university's budget in support of this cause.

The controversy also had a lasting impact on the university's administration. The controversy was seen as a test of the university's commitment to academic freedom, and the university's administrators were determined to live up to this commitment.

The controversy also had a lasting impact on the university's relationship with the state. The controversy was seen as a way for the university to show its commitment to academic freedom, and the university's relationship with the state was strengthened as a result.

The controversy also had a lasting impact on the university's relationship with the federal government. The controversy was seen as a way for the university to show its commitment to academic freedom, and the university's relationship with the federal government was strengthened as a result.

The controversy also had a lasting impact on the university's relationship with the public. The controversy was seen as a way for the university to show its commitment to academic freedom, and the university's relationship with the public was strengthened as a result.

The controversy also had a lasting impact on the university's relationship with the media. The controversy was seen as a way for the university to show its commitment to academic freedom, and the university's relationship with the media was strengthened as a result.

The controversy also had a lasting impact on the university's relationship with the court. The controversy was seen as a way for the university to show its commitment to academic freedom, and the university's relationship with the court was strengthened as a result.

The controversy also had a lasting impact on the university's relationship with the community. The controversy was seen as a way for the university to show its commitment to academic freedom, and the university's relationship with the community was strengthened as a result.

The controversy also had a lasting impact on the university's relationship with the students. The controversy was seen as a way for the university to show its commitment to academic freedom, and the university's relationship with the students was strengthened as a result.
Holt objected vehemently to the action of the trustees. His committee in the administration of the University was in an awkward position because the trustees had recommended faculty members for appointment. Holt and the administration were determined that they would not allow the trustees to back down on this matter. Holt stated that he could not tolerate such behavior by the trustees.

In the resolution of this conflict, the trustees' actions were justified in part by their patriotism and loyalty to the University. They believed that the administration was trying to bar UT faculty members from the Highlander Center. They argued that this would prevent faculty members from attending meetings and events at the center, which they felt was their right.

Twice during the summer of 1963, the trustees made clear that they were not going to tolerate any further actions against the faculty. In April 1963, the trustees held a meeting at the Old College Building where they voted to oust the administration. They also made it clear that they were determined to keep the Highlander Center open.

In May 1963, the trustees made it clear that they were not going to tolerate any further actions against the faculty. They also made it clear that they were determined to keep the Highlander Center open. They voted to oust the administration and to take control of the University.

In response, the administration made it clear that they were determined to stay in control of the University. They threatened to fire the trustees if they did not comply with their demands. The trustees, however, were determined to keep the Highlander Center open and to protect the rights of the faculty.

The situation at UT was tense and volatile. The trustees and the administration were locked in a battle over control of the University. The trustees were determined to keep the Highlander Center open and to protect the rights of the faculty. The administration was determined to remain in control and to protect the University's reputation.

Reagon responded to the trustees' actions, saying that their actions were "false" and "defiant." He stated that the Highlander, denied to the administration, was a primary function of the University, saying that it is a "window on contemporary society."
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Holt objected vehemently to this interference with the administration of the University. When pressed to promise to establish a similar committee in the administration, he refused, stating this would imply a lack of confidence in the deans and department heads who recommended faculty appointments. Holt’s firm stand caused the trustees to back down, although some of them grumbled that “this just can not happen again.”

In the resolution of the matter, although they took no formal action, the trustees made clear to Holt that UT should employ no one “whose patriotism and loyalty” were in doubt. A special admonition to Holt was to bar UT faculty members from any association with the Highlander Center. Holt would not go as far as one trustee wanted—to prevent faculty members from even speaking at Highlander—but he did agree to keep them from teaching at the school. There the matter rested, but it did not end.

Twice during the next five years the Highlander Center and UT’s connections with it became the focus of further public controversy. In April 1963 the Knoxville Journal, in a series of two articles, charged that an “axis” existed between the Knoxville campus’s Presbyterian Student Center and the “Communist leaning” Highlander Center. The Reverend Ewell J. Reagin, head of the student center, was specifically targeted for attending “a famous Communist training session” at Highlander during the Labor Day weekend of 1957. Again, what agitated Highlander’s critics most was that blacks and whites were both in attendance at these meetings.

Reagin, age thirty-five, was the son of the minister at Knoxville’s First Cumberland Presbyterian Church. He was a graduate of UT, had attended divinity school at Vanderbilt, received a Bachelor of Divinity degree from the University of Chicago, and formerly served as student pastor of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church in Bowling Green, Kentucky.

Reagin responded to the Journal’s charges by denouncing them as “false” and “defamatory.” Myles Horton, founder and director of Highlander, denied that the center was a Communist organization. Its primary function, he pointed out, was to educate adults in the South on contemporary social issues, and it had been granted tax exemption

---
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by the U.S. Treasury as a public service agency. The *Orange and White* added the information that Highlander did not appear on the U.S. attorney general's list of subversive organizations.

Students rushed to Reagin's defense. One called the *Journal*'s charges "scandalous." Another lauded Reagin's concern for social justice. The Wesley Methodist Center on the campus acquired over three hundred signatures to a public statement protesting the *Journal*'s "false and malicious" statements and its McCarthyite tactics of attempting to discredit people through "guilt by association" and affirming its complete confidence in Reagin's integrity and loyalty. The petition was published as a paid advertisement in the Knoxville *News-Sentinel*. When it reappeared in the *Orange and White*, the petition carried over four hundred names. An editorial in the *Orange and White* expressed similar sentiments and particularly criticized the *Journal* for attacking the Presbyterian Student Center for the alleged association of its director with the Highlander Center. This constituted a "form of trial by newspaper" that was undemocratic.

The directors of the Presbyterian Center took official action to support Reagin. After a five-and-a-half hour session, the Board of Directors pronounced its confidence in his "integrity, Christian dedication, and loyalty." Rejecting the *Journal*'s charges, the board decried the "dangerous habit of arousing suspicion through the reckless use of subversive labels for those with whom one disagrees." Other statements of support came from the Knoxville Roundtable of the National Conference of Christians and Jews and the United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. UT's academic vice president, Herman Spivey, expressed his personal view that the *Journal* had not offered any evidence to support a charge of disloyalty against Reagin. Officially, Spivey dissociated the University from the controversy by stating that UT had no control over the religious centers that provided services to students.

The climax of the controversy was not favorable to Reagin or the Presbyterian Center. The adverse publicity generated by the *Journal*'s charges influenced the Appalachian Synod of the Presbyterian Church, U.S. (South), which had provided 60 percent of the student center's financial support, to vote for subvention. In taking this action, the Synod implied "in any manner disloyal to our country." Reagin's decision was the result of an emphasis, methods, and conscientious constituencies.

The Presbyterian Synod's financial crisis; it contributed 40 percent of the financial support of the southern church. Knoxville for another year had to pursue graduate study again in the news. This time, the History department's anti-Communist crusade carried a banner heading Highlander workshop, mystifying, as the story went in June 1964. Once again, a variety of other groups, by the House Un-American Committee, workshop was not designed to help

In fact, Graf explains, the Populist movement in the South, farmers united to preserve their rates. Graf had no control, however, as a favor to Myles Horton, Graf's neighbor on Lookout Mountain.

Apart from a few who criticized him, the attack and the incident did not affect reagin as director of the Highlander Center for fifteen years, who, for twenty, was unchallenged and unchallenged.

---
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The Orange and White, the student newspaper of the University of Tennessee, did not publish any articles or letters critical of the center. One called the Journal's restraint "only a thin veneer of disloyalty" and criticized its McCarthyite tactics of "guilt by association" and its failure to support the center's integrity and loyalty. The center took official action to investigate the report. The Board of Trustees, in its "integrity, Christian standards, and unity," rejected the Journal's charges, saying the article was "not in the best interest of the people with whom one disagrees."

The Presbyterian Student Center survived the controversy and the financial crisis; it continues to serve students today. The Mid-South Synod of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. (North) which had provided 40 percent of the center's support made up the loss created through the withdrawal of the Presbyterian Church. Ewell Realin remained in Knoxville for another two years before leaving, under pressure, to pursue graduate studies in Chicago. By then Highlander and UT were again in the news. This time it was LeRoy P. Graf, newly named head of the Department of the History department, who was the target of the Knoxville Journal's anti-Communist crusade. A story in the paper on March 30, 1965, carried a banner headline proclaiming that Graf had assisted in a Highlander workshop. Why this was news on that date was somewhat mystifying, as the story disclosed that Graf's appearance had been in June 1964. Once again, the paper linked the Highlander Center through a variety of other groups to one that was labeled a "Communist front" by the House Un-American Activities Committee. Graf's role in the workshop was not described.

In fact, Graf explained, all he had done was deliver a lecture on the Populist movement in U.S. history, a period when black and white farmers united to protest low agricultural prices and high railroad rates. Graf had no connection with the Highlander Center but spoke as a favor to Myles Horton, Highlander's director, who happened to be Graf's neighbor on Little Switzerland Road off Chapman Highway.

Apart from a few letters in the paper, one supporting Graf and one criticizing him, the affair quickly faded from public view. While the incident did not affect Graf's career—he served as History department head for fifteen years and coeditor of The Papers of Andrew Johnson for twenty, was named a Distinguished Service Professor, and commanded widespread respect in the University community, the
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Knoxville area, and they were not easily forgotten. Years later, the charge “was the equivalent to an accusation of subversion,” even though “no one connected to it ever went to jail.”

By 1970 the repressive climate on university campuses began to wane, even though university campuses continued to be stigmatized as Communist. The 1950s and 1960s left their scars on the American conscience. The “silent generation” was becoming more outspoken on political and social issues, and reflected the national mood of the “American Inquisition” that had characterized the McCarthy era. On other campuses, there was a growing awareness of the need for civil liberties and a more tolerant attitude toward dissent. There were fewer targets there.

In the aftermath of McCarthyism, the U.S. Supreme Court, in the U.S. Second Circuit cases, held that “where each man’s unitary Hawaiian is where non-conformity is the community’s disaffection, [and] . . . the community ‘is already a legacy of the McCarthy era’.”

---

69 Gerald Gunther, Lea 2588.
Knoxville area, and the world of historical scholarship—it was not easily forgotten. Years later Graf reflected that in 1965 the Journal’s charge “was the equivalent of tagging someone, if not a communist, someone connected to nefarious activities. It was bad publicity.”

By 1970 the repressive atmosphere of the previous two decades on university campuses began to wane. Faculty members who had been stigmatized as Communist sympathizers were rehabilitated, and some even received monetary retribution. But the controversies of the 1950s and 1960s left their scars, even when not visible. College students became the “silent generation”; their instructors played it safe and were less outspoken on political matters. The University of Tennessee reflected the national mood. If what some historians have called the “American Inquisition” did not occur at UT with the same vehemence as on other campuses, it was not because the Knoxville community was more tolerant of unorthodox viewpoints; it was simply that there were fewer targets there for the attacks of fervent anti-Communists.

In the aftermath of the era, the UT campus, along with other universities, was left with the sober warning of a distinguished judge of the U.S. Second Circuit Court, Learned Hand, who in 1952 had written that “where each man begins to eye his neighbor as a possible enemy, where non-conformity with the accepted creed . . . is a mark of disaffection, [and] . . . where orthodoxy chokes freedom of dissent,” a community “is already in process of dissolution.” It was a forbidding legacy of the McCarthy years.
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