

ZEDEK

, a quarterly.

The official journal of the
Social Activist Professors
Defense Foundation, the only
independent organization defend-
ing social activist professors who

basic constitutional and civil rights have been violated.

Subscription Rates: \$10/yr. USA/Canada; elsewhere \$12.50/yr.

Institutional Rates: \$15/yr. USA/Canada; elsewhere \$20/yr.

ZEDEK Volume IV, Numbers 2-3

(May/August, 1984)

Page

- 253 Editorials: Legs Against Arms
- 254 Think of Our High Court Before Pulling the Lever
In Tribute: Goodman, Chaney, and Schwerner
- 255 One Teacher in Outer Space = An Empty Sop
- 257 The Struggle Around Tenure and Job Security
- 258 Remembering D-Day: Lessons and Forgetting
- 259 Is There A Sexist Pattern in the Academic World?
by Helen R. Samberg
- 260 Voter Registration: The Way to Defeat Reagan
by Helen Samberg.
- 262 45 Years of Academic Repression: A Personal Statement
by Herbert Aptheker
- 265 Herbert Aptheker: Biographical Sketch and Interview
- 269 Cases of Academic Repression Reviewed in ZEDEK
(1980-1984)
- 270 The Little Professor Who
Stood Up to the Nazis: A
Relatively Unknown Story
About Käthe Kollwitz by R.M.
Frumkin
- 273 Back to School by Marc Cooper
and Greg Goldin
- 274 Nancy Shaw Fights Back by
Helen R. Samberg
- 275 A Note on Ronald Aronson's
New Book, THE DIALECTICS OF
DISASTER
- 276 The Significance of the Starsky
Case by R.M. Frumkin
- 280 Starsky and Kollwitz
- 281 SAPDF Seeking New Supporters
- 281 SAPDF Endorsers



37 SELF PORTRAIT

Lithograph 1934

(Käthe Kollwitz) See her little
known story on pages 270-273.

ZEDEK, the official journal of the Social Activist Professors Defense Foundation is published at 19329 Monte Vista, Detroit, Michigan 48221 U.S.A.

Editor: R.M. Frumkin . Associate Editors: Helen R. Samberg, F. Joseph Smith.

All news items, articles, reviews, letters, contributions, and other correspondence should be sent to the above address. Materials expected to be returned should be accompanied by self-addressed stamped envelopes with the proper postage.

Editorials

LEGS AGAINST ARMS : THE NUMBER-ONE PROBLEM IN 1980 IS STILL THE NUMBER-ONE PROBLEM IN 1984

In ZEDEK's very first editorial (Nov., '80), entitled "David Riesman and the Number-One Problem" we stated that the most important problem facing the nation and the world was the control of nuclear weapons and the prevention of a nuclear war. Unless we really solve this problem all other

problems, no matter how important, will become rather academic. Today, four years later, that NUMBER-ONE PROBLEM is still Number One. In recognition of this fact, many American women are really taking some responsibility in the areas where survival issues are at stake.

At this point in time we have a strong woman candidate for the Vice-Presidency of the U.S. She is beginning to relate to the issues of greatest concern ---detente and arms control, unemployment, etc. The Physicians for Social Responsibility, too long dormant, has been revitalized and is now playing a critical role in the Nuclear Freeze Movement thanks to Dr. Helen Caldicott, a physician who has given up practicing as physician at a Boston hospital in order to devote full-time to rallying support for a Nuclear Freeze. She is saving her children, she says, as she speaks out boldly against Reagan (with whom she spent 1½ hours of total and "surprisingly uninformed dullness"). Likewise, it was not surprising that the Detroit Area Nuclear Weapons Freeze used Mother's Day as the "Legs Against Arms" Walk-A-Thon, a woman's day with all the commercialism converted to meaningfulness. The goal was to raise \$50,000 through pledges of not less than \$1.00 per kilometer. Some 1500 stalwarts, absolutely drenched and frozen walked along the Detroit riverfront to their Belle Isle pavilion destination. Joy was truly achieved when the final tally reached \$55,000! A meaningful Mother's Day indeed!

Young, Old, Big, Small — Bring Them All!
NUCLEAR WEAPONS FREEZE WALK-A-THON
 (Dress Note: Heavy, freezing rain predicted. Dress wisely.)
LEGS AGAINST ARMS
 Belle Isle (Detroit)
 Sunday, May 13



Take a first step to halt the nuclear weapons race. Join the Freeze Walk-A-Thon. Money raised will help finance the campaign for a mutual, verifiable, nuclear weapons freeze.

* * * * *

Editorials

THINK OF OUR HIGH COURT BEFORE PULLING THE LEVER

One of the most significant issues in the present presidential campaign which is least addressed despite its "heart of the matter" priority in our future as a nation is, "What sort of a high court will you be voting for?"* This is undoubtedly the area of greatest difference between Reagan and Mondale.

In the nearly 200 years since our Supreme Court was founded its power has become close to absolute -- its appointees reflecting the philosophy of the appointing president. One must remember that the justices bench life endures for many years after the president who put them there.

A statistical observation worth considering before pulling the lever on November 6th is that "Our present Supreme Court is composed of 7 justices named by Republicans and 2 by Democrats. Liberal appointees in the District Courts have fared as follows in 1983-84: The D.C. Circuit (most extensive jurisdiction) was reversed in all 8 reviewed cases by this Supreme Court; the 9th District with 23 judges, was reversed in 23 of 27 reviewed cases. The 1st District had 2 of seven affirmed. The 8th only 2 of 10 and the 10th only 1 of 6 affirmed. Of 58 cases reviewed, in total 9 were affirmed. It is like paying for the piper's tune. Who names the judges shapes the law."*

#####

*From an article by James J. Kilpatrick, UPS.

IN TRIBUTE: GOODMAN, CHANEY, AND SCHWERNER

Twenty years ago voter registration was a crucial issue in the U.S.A. It was a long hot summer, 1964, when the right to vote was in a life-death struggle. Despite the U.S.CONSTITUTION's guarantees to Black American citizens in our Southern states, Blacks were disenfranchised in actuality. Their disenfranchisement was somewhat reminiscent of Soweto, Union of South Africa.



A headstone at Mt. Nebo Baptist Church in Philadelphia, Miss., honors three men killed 20 years ago. **

In 1964, symbolizing the upward struggle, and its high cost, against racism in practice, were three young men who had gone to Philadelphia, Mississippi as volunteers to help and encourage Black

(continued on next page)

** DETROIT FREE PRESS, 6/12/84.

EditorialsGoodman, Chaney & Schwerner(continued)

citizens assert their basic right denied them -- the right to register to vote.

For this dedicated work which challenged the prevalent resistance to change and sharing of power, these three freedom fighters -- Andrew Goodman, James Earl Chaney, and Michael H. Schwerner -- were ruthlessly murdered by "law-keepers."

Finally, pressure and embarrassment nationally ended in these uniformed bigots responsible for the three deaths (murders) serving brief jail sentences on charges of intrusion of the civil rights of the young activists.

The date and deed of the murders of Goodman, Chaney and Schwerner are recalled only when our memories are jogged. Since their deaths -- twenty years ago -- barriers have come down considerably in the racial struggle in Mississippi, but there is still a distance to go, as is the case throughout our land.

There is, unfortunately, only one known memorial anywhere to these young American men -- one Black and two Jewish. It is a single headstone on the grounds of the Mt. Nebo Baptist Church in Philadelphia, Mississippi. (See the photo of the memorial on page 254)

We would hope that the many, perhaps millions, of formerly disenfranchised whose fight for the right to register and vote proved to be the death of Schwerner, Chaney and Goodman, will exercise this right during this most critical presidential election in U.S. history. In these times, that would be the most fitting memorial.

* * * * *

ONE TEACHER IN OUTER SPACE = AN EMPTY SOP

The Reagan attempt to trade on his guile by offering the glory of the first civilian to walk in his celestial space flight to a woman teacher fell flat for the National Education Association's President Mary Hatwood Futrell. Her response is a clear picture and indictment of where and what Reagan stands in the U.S. educational scene both for children and teachers. Ms. Futrell and the NEA's 1,700,000 members are just not buying the Reagan sop. Ronald Reagan was pitching for votes but the NEA responded on Friday, August 31st with its 1,700,000 members unequivocally supporting the Mondale-Ferraro ticket.



Ms. Futrell began with a clear direct statement "We don't need to send a teacher into outer space, we need to send teachers into classrooms fully equipped and ready to help students learn." Futrell found the usual give little with one hand and take away a lot with the other when, following his gesture of a special outer space trip, he repeated that "educators should improve their schools without more help from the federal government."

(continued on next page)

Teacher in Space (continued)

Reagan's attempt at projecting an image as the friend of educators falls flat since gimmicks will not easily fool educators. As Ms. Futrell stated "One teacher sent into space won't solve school problems on earth. If the president is so interested in education why does his administration cut the support funding?"

Ms. Futrell compares the record on education of the Republican Party under Reagan with the record of President Carter and the Democratic Party and even with other Republican presidents, namely, Presidents Eisenhower and Nixon. Far and away, under the Reagan Administration, federal funding is the lowest in level in twenty years. It is not solely a partisan perception. The Higher Education Act of 1972 making college more available for many financially deprived young people was under a Republican President. Title IX was also a 1972 Amendment. It has been under Reagan that some healthy teeth of this Amendment related to funding and practiced sex discrimination were pulled this year.

Ms. Futrell refers to the American education system as a "three-tiered partnership of local, state and federal government" understood bipartisan in nature excepting the current White House people. She sees Congress, governors, mayors and state legislators cognizant of this partnership "while the White House never misses an opportunity to belittle the federal role."

In 1984 Senator Robert Stafford, a Republican leader from Vermont, was the winner of the National Education Association's most important honor, the Friend of Education Award. In opposing the White House's position on education, Senator Stafford has stated: "Some would say that the federal government's role is limited but how can we limit our contribution when the need is so great? If we are ready to push back the limits of space with our space program, if we are willing to push back the limits of medical science with basic research, we must simultaneously be willing to push back the levels of ignorance with an enhanced educational system."

Ms. Futrell puts forth the importance of no division into pro and anti public school camps -- "anything less than quality education for every child means trouble -- not just in the classroom."

Let us hope that parents are no more easily beguiled than teachers in November.*

#

* For a more complete statement of Ms. Futrell's views on the issue discussed above see her article entitled "Teachers: Shuttle Diplomacy Fails," DETROIT FREE PRESS, August 30, 1984.

**BETTER ACTIVE TODAY THAN RADIOACTIVE
TOMORROW**

EditorialTHE STRUGGLE AROUND TENURE AND JOB SECURITY

Faculty freedom is, as is so much of our post-McCarthy freedom, on alert against administration take-backs. The general conservatism abreast is to tell workers at all levels, blue and white collar alike -- you have two choices: "Give back what we ask of your negotiated gains or we'll cry 'financial exigency' and out you go!" That is the prevalent union-busting tactic of our day. Of course, no union = no job security and no grievance rights which is quite a "leap" backwards for all workers.

At Wayne State University (Detroit) the issue of "fundamental change" in contract negotiations, another administrative word for union concessions, is an example of what is happening in academia all over the U.S.A. Safeguards guaranteeing faculty input into major policy decisions are being stripped away.

Walter Metzger, for 27 years a member of the AAUP's national Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee, was in Detroit for a bargaining discussion recently and pointed out that "Many universities are using non-tenure track systems of hiring instructors. This and the increased use of guest lecturers, and continually renewing those on temporary assignments and appointments, all run contrary to the 1940 AAUP STATEMENT ON TENURE and its purpose: job security. Many persons accept non-tenure track and endless yearly appointments with no job security over what they charge as a 'clannish, iron-clad tenure system' and thus are playing into this simulation of managerial toughness in order to falsely save their shaky jobs."

Professor Christopher Johnson, chief negotiator of the Wayne State University AAUP Chapter said that the union and administration are far apart on several issues, including the determined administrative position of a stronger non-tenure track hiring system. Johnson summarized the distance between bargainers as: "They want 155 guest lecturers, AAUP would accept a limit of 110; they want 35 'academic associates' while AAUP would set a limit of 10; they want no limit on non-tenure track faculty members, the AAUP wants to set a maximum of four years. In a word, the University wants to create an internal labor market which will undermine the position of tenured faculty."

This scene is not as rare as it should be nor has been. The declining enrollment, due to economics in the past four years, the decline of the Liberal Arts appeal among our youth, the slack following the post-War baby boom (and their babies), the decrease in funding of special studies and the resulting scramble for faculty employment, overlaid with a creeping conservatism, all erode the image and the reality of faculty freedom.

* * * * *

Read the HARVARD EDUCATIONAL REVIEW's Special Issue, "Education and the Threat of Nuclear War" published in August, 1984.

Copies are \$8.00 each and may be ordered by writing to:

Harvard Educational Review
Longfellow Hall, 13 Appian Way
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138.

Editorials

Jim Borgman
The Cincinnati Enquirer
King Features Syndicate

8/19/84

"...and I've got a million of 'em!

REMEMBERING D-DAY: THE LESSONS AND FORGETTINGS

June 6, 1984 commemorated D-Day when 176,000 allied troops hit the Normandy beaches 40 years ago. This was a tremendous turning point in World War II -- a long awaited action which, coupled with our other ally, the Soviet Union dealing with the Nazi invaders on their own soil, helped the final defeat of the Nazis. Amidst all the hollow-sounding slogans and the pledges of "Never Again War", seldom do we hear either on TV or in the news accounts any reference made to D-Day as the long sought for Second Front. The delay in opening the Second Front seems, to many progressive students of history, but a stratagem of the anti-Soviet allied nations who wished that the Nazis and Russians would hopefully destroy each other. If the Western allied nations had opened up that Second Front in 1942, one wonders how many millions of lives would have been saved -- civilians, extermination camp victims, and millions of soldiers? And what kind of world would we have had today, if those many millions who had lost their lives had been allowed to live out their normal span of years?

What really was learned from the destruction of Nazi Germany? Have we, has the world, become a better, safer place? Have we learned to live and let live? Have we become more brotherly/sisterly ---or are we still not scotching the snake of hate and war? We still support an Administration which, with its prayers each night, imagines that "The Russians are coming, the Russians are coming, and that we must destroy them before they destroy us."

It is true that there will never be a Normandy Beach invasion again but one also ponders on whether or not there will be a beach which people and other living things will be around to know. Nuclear weapons are 8 minutes away from a first strike on Moscow and the people aren't even at the White House gates shouting: "FREEZE!--Hell No, we won't go!"

* * * * *

IS THERE A SEXIST PATTERN IN THE ACADEMIC WORLD?by Helen R. Samberg

As we see the regressive direction of our society, we must take notice, as one barometer of this regression, of the number of women being shafted from academic positions which were so recently opened to them. An "uppity" woman is again (or still?) a threat to the status quo of conservatism. A woman espousing women's issues politically active, self-assertive, is in trouble today. Her career life is in even greater jeopardy if she is non-conforming in what should be her private life -- sex orientation.

Katherine van Wormer, social activist, sociologist, and feminist at Kent State University, lost her tenure quest because she shared her progressive views with her students. Her First Amendment rights were grossly violated by the Kent State University. (See the February, 1983 issue of ZEDEK, III, pp.169-171)



Shirley Nuss, social activist, sociologist, feminist, is now entering her third year of trying to get tenure and her job back at the Wayne State University (Detroit). She has many supporters both here in the U.S. and abroad. Although she and Katherine van Wormer have fine reputations as productive scholars both have been the subject of deprecatory remarks about their alleged lack of the "proper kind of scholarship." Nuss is still unemployed and her case is going into arbitration shortly. Her funds are near depletion. (We are enclosing a supportive petition with this issue of ZEDEK.) The present burden grows more serious with each passing month. Please send contributions to: The Committee to Support Professor Shirley Nuss, P.O. Box 9914, Troy, Michigan 48099. (See the following issues of ZEDEK: May, 1983, III, pp.177-185 and February, 1984, IV, pp.247-249)

Merle Woo, social activist, socialist, and feminist, just won a victory which is described as a "grand and public victory for First Amendment rights: free speech and association, and discrimination based on race, sex, sexuality and political ideology." The Woo case was most carefully worked out strategically (See figure below). Woo accepted an out of court settlement of a two-year contract, plus a \$48,584 settlement and \$25,000 attorney fees. A good fight Merle! (See ZEDEK, III, pp.230-232 & IV, pp.250-251)

* * * * *

State Complaint

In Merle Woo's case the legal documents were never confined to arguing the technicalities alone. They were designed, by Mary Dunlap, Woo's attorney, and the MWDC legal team, to be a concise, clear and politically strong exposure of all the issues of the case. Write for a copy of Woo's State Complaint.

A copy of Woo's State Complaint is well worth purchasing. Send \$1.00 to:
MWDC, 2661 21st St.
San Francisco, Cal.
94110.

VOTER REGISTRATION: THE WAY TO DEFEAT REAGAN

by Helen R. Samberg

The Social Activist Professors Defense Foundation and its quarterly ZEDEK have, of course, their core concern around the fate of professors and other faculty people who are or have been in a struggle to retain or regain jobs which have been threatened or lost because of their non-conformist activities, social activism, and critical orientation toward every matter of relevance on and off campus. It is in this light that we depart from discussing another specific current case of academic repression and turn to what we feel is vital to sustain not a job but, as we see it, the whole future structure of our society, including its institutions of higher learning.

For the first time since the 1972 elections we cannot afford political pointing and say that we are voting for the lesser of two evils. There are distinct differences on the issues addressed and proposed. We are confronted with the possibility of a U.S. Supreme Court which will endorse prayer in the schools, undoubtedly rule against ERA, further anti-labor laws, deny the right of choice in the matter of abortions, and continue to turn back the clock on a number of hard-won entitlements in civil rights and justice -- such as the Grove City decision on Title IX* and other decisions. So many gains of the past 50 years are quickly slipping away.

There are differences from the present Dr. Strangelove-type Reagan persona which jokes about "outlawing the Soviet Union" and bombing 200 million people "in FIVE MINUTES," to the more sane approach of the Democrats who seek detente and a nuclear freeze, and who do not make light of issues which really threaten the future existence of all life on earth. There are other differences: Vice-Presidential candidate Geraldine Ferraro said that she would not have sought military solutions in Grenada and that the students (our U.S. citizens to be "rescued" by Reagan) she interviewed only felt frightened by the U.S. invaders jolting them out of their living quarters. Most of all on the Democratic ticket we have people with whom to reason around the nuclear acceleration issues -- and certainly we all understand that nothing remains in place unless the freeze occurs.

By no means is this to say that Mondale/Ferraro are the answer ultimately but reality says that choices are only two this time around because of the accelerating (and insidious) drive toward conservatism affecting control of every significant aspect of our lives. And the best formula to come our way is "Beating Reagan -- The Politics of Voter Registration," appearing in the July 21-28, 1984 issue of THE NATION. The formula was written by Joel Rogers, an assistant professor of political science at Rutgers. It shows the significance of every individual's vote adding up to what could be decisive in a given precinct; therefore, the registration of those people who either through intimidation, alienation, poverty, or habitual abstention have not been voting is now vital. All the untapped non-registrants must be found and helped to enroll and encouraged to go on to the polls on November 6th to cast their votes.

* See ZEDEK, IV, p.239.

Voter Registration-Smith (continued)

Human Serve, an agency which organizes public and private social service agencies to offer voter registration as a part of its regular services, has already registered well over 500,000 voters as of July. There are many active organizations throughout the country involved in this effort. One must not forget two very important points in this strategy: 1. About 87 percent of registered voters vote but 78,000,000 eligible Americans did not register and vote in 1980. 2. Ronald Reagan actually received only 27 percent of the V.A.P. (voting age people) vote in 1980, according to the U.S. Census Bureau estimates. Thus, the agreement around this voter registration strategy is ever increasingly endorsed. We realize that the less formally educated and the less financially able and the greatly disenchanted young people are the largest pool of unregistered potential voters. Some estimate this to be as high as 60 percent of the V.A.P. This adds up to many, many millions of people to enroll.

Whether one has a political philosophy beyond the limited one of the Democratic Party and its goals is not and should not be a deciding factor at this point. One must join hands in getting ourselves and everyone else we know registered to vote. Our duty and our only chance to avert a possible Armageddon lies in this united effort to register millions of unregistered voters in what might be the most important election in the history of the U.S. and the world.

* * * * *



Frank Rowe was an art instructor at San Francisco St. University in 1950 when he was fired for refusing to sign an unconstitutional loyalty oath. While some others fired committed suicide or drifted in depression, Rowe started a 27-year fight for reinstatement in his job, and then moved his battle to the State of California for compensation for himself and others. His 27-year fight will be the subject of an article in a future issue of ZEDEK.



Frank Rowe

Thank you. MONTHLY REVIEW
and Bertell Oilman

Yes -- ZEDEK only-----	\$10.00
SAPDF membership & ZEDEK ---	\$20.00

(See pg. 281 of ZEDEK's issue.)

Editors' Note: One of the great tragedies of our alleged democratic state is that those progressive scholars who challenge its profit-oriented, racist, anti-humanistic ideologies and practices are likely to lead lives of personal economic deprivation and academic repression regardless of their talents. For the past 45 years Herbert Aptheker, an internationally recognized historian and scholar, has been, unfortunately, one of those victims. In his own words, he discusses his experience with academic repression in the United States. Following his statement ZEDEK has reprinted a recent CONTEMPORARY AUTHORS biographical sketch(including a list of his many publications) and an informative interview by Walter W. Ross.

45 YEARS OF ACADEMIC REPRESSION: A PERSONAL STATEMENT *

by Herbert Aptheker

Because of my political views and activities, I have been denied any normal, regular, permanent, tenured teaching position at an American college or university. The following account is based upon memory.

In 1937 I received my master's degree from Columbia University, the thesis being NAT TURNER'S SLAVE REBELLION (finally published as a book in 1966 by the Humanities Press and Grove Press). I continued graduate study at that University and then sought appointment to the history department at City College in New York City. My appointment was all but finalized when a red-baiting campaign against teachers and the then information Teachers' Union began in the Hearst Press. This eventuated in the Rapp-Courdert hearings** which led to the firing of dozens of teachers and professors ---including people like Howard Selsam, Morris U. Schappes, Jack and Phil Foner, and Herbert Morais and others. My pending appointment was terminated and I was "named" in the Rapp-Coudert hearing by a professional informer --- who said he knew me as a C.P. member and said my name was "Henry Apotheker"! The fact is that at that time I was not a member of any Party, though this whole witch-hunting episode was one element in "recruiting" me.



Herbert Aptheker

I continued my graduate work, and other odd jobs but college employment was simply out of the question. Came the war and from February, 1942 until April, 1946 I was in the field artillery. [Editors' Note: Aptheker achieved the rank of major in that branch of the U.S. Army]

* This is a revision of a statement originally presented at the 1980 national meetings of the American Sociological Association at a seminar on academic repression.

** On the Rapp-Coudert hearings see the February, 1982 issue of ZEDEK, pp. 74-76.

Academic Repression-Aptheker(continued)

On return from Europe--by now having my doctor's degree from Columbia University (granted in February, 1943, with the University publishing my AMERICAN NEGRO SLAVE REVOLTS, 1943)-- I went to see Professor William Westermann, with whom I had been close as a student and who had been president of the American Historical Association. This was sometime in 1946. The meeting was very cordial; I asked about the possibility of appointment--being then, I thought both a gentleman and an officer -- and was told plainly by Westermann: "Herbert, you belong on campus but Columbia would not hire a Communist."

I could get no employment and matters were not easy--I was married and we then had a baby daughter* But luckily I was granted a Guggenheim Fellowship(1946-47) which then paid \$3000 and on this we managed --and I worked on the DOCUMENTARY HISTORY OF THE NEGRO PEOPLE IN THE U.S., as per Fellowship. (Three volumes appeared, 1951, 1973, 1975, the Citadel Press publisher.) It was at this time also that Dr. W.E.B. DuBois invited me to use his office at the NAACP in New York City, and asked me to edit his papers and works.

I tried to interest publishers in the latter effort but failed at that time -- though since his death two projects for the publication of both his letters and unpublished papers and his COLLECTED PUBLISHED WORKS, have materialized and are in process.

Thereafter, I actively sought academic employment and was rejected in the 1940s, 1950s and almost all of the 1960s by Howard University, Columbia University, Reed College, University College at the University of Buffalo. These are named because with them there was actual correspondence and in the cases of Reed and Buffalo promises of employment from history departments -- then cancelled by Administration. Many others were approached by me verbally.

My first college employment came in 1969 at Bryn Mawr College in Pennsylvania. This resulted from the demands of the Black women there (then about thirty of them) that a course in Black history be given and that I teach it. These young women were quite persistent and finally threatened to strike unless this were done. I was invited to give a guest lecture and did so and was hired to be a "guest lecturer" for one day a week. I taught a course on Afro-American history and a seminar on The Life and Work of DuBois (my salary was \$6000). This lasted about three years. Through the efforts of the Black students and myself we got agreement from Bryn Mawr that it would appoint a Black faculty member (there were none then) if one was located of suitable quality and that he would take over my duties. This was done, I think in 1971 or 1972. That ended that employment.

I then was able to get a position in the social sciences department of Hostos Community College(part of the City University of New York) in the Bronx as a "lecturer," two days a week.

* Bettina Aptheker, author of the very relevant THE ACADEMIC REBELLION IN THE UNITED STATES(1972).

Academic Repression- Aptheker(continued)

I taught three classes--Introduction to History, Black History, and Introduction to Political Economy. This lasted three years. Sometime in 1975 (after having lectured publicly in New Haven) I was invited by a Dean at one of the Colleges of Yale to offer a seminar on DuBois. I was interviewed; everything was approved. I was asked by the College to supply a reading list and outline and to send the bookstore a list of required books. All was in readiness when I was phoned just before Christmas (I think 1975) and told that my appointment was disapproved -- this following a procedure unprecedented in the history of Yale. A battle then ensued which lasted about 18 months and finally -- after demonstrations, petitions, etc. -- I was appointed and did teach a seminar at Yale (I believe it was in 1976) for one term on DuBois.

I then moved to California in 1977. As the result of the initiative of a Black woman student at the Law School of the University of California in Berkeley I have taught one night a week there what is called a 295 course (i.e., one called for by students --but with full credit). This is on Racism in U.S. Law. I am not considered part of the faculty--am not in the catalogue and am paid (\$1000) as an "honorarium" not as a salary. I have been asked by students to do this every term since (except one, when I was a visiting professor of history at Humboldt University, Berlin, German Democratic Republic, in 1980). I have also been a visiting lecturer at the University of Santa Clara and now am a Resident Scholar at that University. It seems always "visiting" but, fortunately, the visits multiply.

I should add that the appointment at Bryn Mawr aroused widespread opposition from certain alumni groups but this was resisted successfully by the students. In the case of Hostos there was a campaign against me under the auspices of the Conservative Party, complete with leafleting, etc. but this also was resisted successfully.

The above is a bare chronological account strictly limited to the question of faculty appointment at colleges in the United States as I have experienced this from 1939 to 1984. It may be relevant to add that during this period I have published articles and reviews in most of the leading professional journals in the fields of history and political science; have published over 30 volumes by publishers like Harper and Row, University of Massachusetts Press, Citadel, Harcourt, Brace & Jovanovich, International, Kraus-Thomson, etc. and that my books have been translated into Japanese, Portuguese, German, French, Slovak, Russian, Spanish and that most of my books remain in print. I've also given papers (beginning around 1966) at meetings of most leading historical organizations. Nevertheless, my appointments in colleges in the United States have been, as stated above, non-tenured type, non-permanent type positions. I have not written about FBI harassment and counter-intelligence provocations, physical assaults, insults, libels, threats against my wife and daughter and other normal consequences of radical activities in the U.S. since World War II since they are not precisely on the subject--though they are surely related phenomena!

#####

Editors' Note: In CONTEMPORARY AUTHORS, New Revision Series, Volume 6, 1982, pages 28-32, there is a biographical sketch of Herbert Aptheker which includes a list of his major writings and a very informative interview with Walter W. Ross. We have reprinted that sketch and interview in order to supplement Aptheker's rather modest autobiographical sketch. Like Scott Nearing, Aptheker has lead a meaningful and constructive life in spite of the forces against him in our society.

APTHEKER

CONTEMPORARY AUTHORS • New Revision Series, Volume 6

APTHEKER, Herbert 1915-

PERSONAL: Surname is pronounced *ap-tek-er*; born July 31, 1915, in Brooklyn, N.Y.; son of Benjamin (a manufacturer) and Rebecca (Komar) Aptheker; married Fay P. Aptheker, September 2, 1942; children: Bettina. **Education:** Columbia University, B.S., 1936, A.M., 1937, Ph.D., 1943. **Home:** 211 South 15th St., San Jose, Calif. 95112. **Office:** 480 North First St., San Jose, Calif. 95112.

CAREER: *Masses and Mainstream*, New York City, associate editor, 1948-53; *Political Affairs*, New York City, editor, 1953-

63; director, American Institute for Marxist Studies, 1964—. Lecturer throughout United States and Europe, 1946—. Member of history department staff, Bryn Mawr College, 1969-73; professor, Hostos Community College of the City University of New York, 1971-77; Du Bois Lecturer, University of Massachusetts—Amherst, 1971-72; visiting lecturer at Yale University, 1976, and University of California at Berkeley Law School, 1978; visiting professor, Humboldt University, Berlin, 1980. **Military service:** U.S. Army, Field Artillery, 1942-46; became major. **Member:** Association for Study of Negro Life and History, American Historical Association, Organization of American Historians, Academy of Political Science.

AWARDS, HONORS: Association for Study of Negro Life and History history award, 1939, heritage award, 1969; Guggenheim fellow, 1946-47; Fund for Social Analysis award, 1960; Social Science Research Council grant, 1961; Rabinowitz Foundation grant, 1965; Ph.D. (H.C.), Martin Luther University, Halle, Germany, 1966; American Council of Learned Societies grant, 1974; Paul Robeson scholar, Rutgers University, 1981.

WRITINGS: *The Negro in the Civil War*, International Publishers, 1938; *Negro Slave Revolts in the United States, 1526-1860*, International Publishers, 1939; *The Negro in the American Revolution*, International Publishers, 1940; *The Negro in the Abolitionist Movement*, International Publishers, 1941; *American Negro Slave Revolts*, Columbia University Press, 1943, new edition, International Publishers, 1969; *Essays in the History of the American Negro*, International Publishers, 1945; *The Negro People in America*, International Publishers, 1946; *To Be Free: Studies in American Negro History*, International Publishers, 1948.

(Editor) *A Documentary History of the Negro People in the United States*, Citadel, Volume I: *From Colonial Times through the Founding of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People*, preface by W.E.B. Du Bois, 1951, Volume II: *1910-1932*, preface by Charles H. Wesley, 1973, Volume III: *1933-1945*, preface by William L. Patterson, 1975; *Lau-reates of Imperialism*, Mainstream, 1954; *History and Reality*, Marzani & Munsell, 1955, 2nd edition published as *The Era of McCarthyism*, 1962; *Toward Negro Freedom*, New Century, 1956; *The Truth about Hungary*, Mainstream, 1957; *A History of the American People*, International Publishers, Volume I: *The Colonial Era*, 1959, 2nd edition, 1966, Volume II: *The American Revolution, 1763-1783*, 1960, Volume III: *Early Years of the Republic: From the End of the Revolution to the First Administration of Washington (1783-1793)*, 1976.

(Editor) *Disarmament and the American Economy*, New Century, 1960; *The World of C. Wright Mills*, Marzani & Munsell, 1960; *Dare We Be Free?*, New Century, 1961; (editor) *And Why Not Every Man?: The Story of the Fight against Negro Slavery*, Seven Seas Publishers, 1961, published as *And Why Not Every Man?: Documentary Story of the Fight against Slavery in the United States*, International Publishers, 1971; *American Foreign Policy and the Cold War*, New Century, 1962; *The Negro Today*, Marzani & Munsell, 1962; *Soul of the Republic*, Marzani & Munsell, 1964; *One Continual Cry: David Walker's Appeal to the Colored Citizens of the World, 1829-1830, Its Setting and Its Meaning*, Humanities Press, 1965; (editor) *Marxism and Democracy*, Humanities Press, 1965; (editor) *Marxism and Alienation*, Humanities Press, 1965; *Nat Turner's Slave Rebellion*, Humanities Press, 1966; *Mission to Hanoi*, prefaces by Tom Hayden and Staughton Lynd, International Publishers, 1966; *The Nature of Democracy, Freedom, and Revolution*, International Publishers, 1967, 2nd edition, 1981; (editor) W.E.B. Du Bois, *Autobiography of W.E.*


(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

Scholarly publications (Open Court, Liberty Press/Classics, University Presses). Save 25%. Literary Services (D), Box 10820, Pittsburgh, PA 15236.

Gifts

**VICTORIAN
RUBBER STAMPS**
Hundreds of Designs
ILLUSTRATED CATALOGUE \$2.

GOOD IMPRESSIONS
DEPT. A
1122 AVERY
St. Parkersburg
W.VA. 26101



Burghardt Du Bois: A Soliloquy on Viewing My Life from the Last Decade of its First Century, International Publishers, 1968; (editor) *Marxism and Christianity*, Humanities Press, 1968.

The Urgency of Marxist-Christian Dialogue, Harper, 1970; *Afro-American History: The Modern Era*, Citadel, 1971; (contributor) J. Alan Winter, editor, *The Poor: A Culture of Poverty or a Poverty of Culture*, Eerdmans, 1971; (editor) Du Bois, *The Education of Black People, Ten Critiques, 1906-1960*, University of Massachusetts Press, 1973; *Annotated Bibliography of the Published Writings of W.E.B. Du Bois*, Kraus-Thomson, 1973; (editor) *The Correspondence of W.E.B. Du Bois*, University of Massachusetts Press, Volume I: 1877-1934, 1973, Volume II: 1934-1944, 1976, Volume III: 1944-1963, 1978; (editor) *The Complete Published Work of W.E.B. Du Bois*, forty volumes, Kraus-Thomson, 1973—; *The Unfolding Drama: Studies in U.S. History*, edited by daughter, Bettina Aptheker, International Publishers, 1979; (editor and author of introduction) Du Bois, *Prayers for Dark People*, University of Massachusetts Press, 1980. Also contributor of literary biography of Du Bois to *American Writers*, Scribner, supplement volume, 1981.

Author of numerous monographs and shorter works, including: *The Labor Movement in the South During Slavery*, International Publishers, 1954; *Negro History: Its Lessons for Our Time*, New Century, 1956; *The United States and China: Peace or War?*, New Century, 1958; *Freedom in History*, New Century, 1958; *The Nature of Revolution: The Marxist Theory of Social Change*, New Century, 1959; *Since Sputnik: How Americans View the Soviet Union*, New Century, 1959; *On the Nature of Revolution: The Marxist Theory of Social Change*, New Century, 1959; *On the Nature of Freedom: The Marxist View*, New Century, 1960; *John Brown: American Martyr*, New Century, 1960; *The American Civil War*, International Publishers, 1961; *The New Secession—And How to Smash It*, New Century, 1961; *Reality and Mythology in Today's Japan*, New Century, 1961; *Riding to Freedom*, New Century, 1961; *The Fraud of "Soviet Anti-Semitism"*, New Century, 1962; *Communism: Menace or Promise?*, New Century, 1963; *Dr. Martin Luther King, Vietnam and Civil Rights*, New Outlook, 1967; *Czechoslovakia and Counter-Revolution: Why the Socialist Countries Intervened*, New Outlook, 1969; (with Bettina Aptheker) *Racism and Reaction in the United States: Two Marxian Studies*, New Outlook, 1971; *The Mid-East: Which Way to Peace*, Committee for a Just Peace in the Middle East (New York), c. 1971; *Heavenly Days in Dixie; or, The Time of Their Lives*, Political Affairs (New York), c. 1975.

Contributor to professional journals. Member of editorial board, *Mainstream*, 1955—; editor, *Jewish Affairs*, 1978—.

WORK IN PROGRESS: Additional volumes of *The Complete Published Work of W.E.B. Du Bois*, for Kraus-Thomson; a volume of unpublished essays by Du Bois, for University of Massachusetts Press; *A History of the Abolitionist Movement*, for Twayne; *A History of Anti-Racism in the U.S.*, for Greenwood.

SIDELIGHTS: In 1946 W.E.B. Du Bois asked Herbert Aptheker to edit his correspondence and personal papers. Aptheker agreed and when Du Bois left for Ghana in 1961, two years before his death, he turned over to Aptheker his correspondence (approximately 100,000 letters) and other papers. As Jay Saunders Redding notes in *Phylon*, there were a number of black intellectuals who felt that Du Bois's choice of Aptheker was not a wise decision on two grounds. First, "Aptheker was white, and editing the correspondence of a black American of Dr. Du Bois's stature and international prominence was a job for a Negro American, they said. What could a white man

know about living as a black man in America? How could a white man be expected to understand and respond sympathetically to the Negro American experience?" Second, Aptheker "was an avowed Marxist, and for Dr. Du Bois to choose someone of that 'political persuasion' to edit his papers gave substance to the allegation (bruted about by McCarthy's gang) that he, Du Bois, was himself a Communist: an 'enemy of the State' and of the American way of life."

Reviewing the published volumes of Du Bois's correspondence, edited by Aptheker, Redding asserts his belief that Du Bois's choice of Aptheker was "good, and this three-volume collection of correspondence is proof positive. It is an excellent job of editing." The reviewer for *Choice* agrees with Redding's assessment, commenting: "The editor has not only been wise in his selections, but has presented succinct and illuminating introductions and notes explaining the circumstances involved in the correspondence and the identities of the correspondents and personalities mentioned. In all, [this is] an excellently edited work of major significance." A writer in *The Past Before Us: Contemporary Historical Writing in the U.S.* calls the *Correspondence* "an indispensable resource for scholars in American history and for those general readers who regard Afro-American history as central."

Eric Foner of the *New York Times Book Review* credits Aptheker's "perseverance" for making these volumes available at all (for a long time no publisher would even consider the project) and remarks that for Aptheker, "the essentially unassisted task of editing was very much a labor of love." Foner calls the editing of the *Correspondence* "able, the footnotes brief but pertinent, and the reasons for the inclusion of the letters compelling. . . . Herbert Aptheker has given us a landmark in Afro-American history."

One reviewer who is critical of Aptheker's editing of Du Bois's correspondence is Michael Cooke of the *New Republic*. Cooke believes that the published correspondence "manage[s] to de-vitalize if not to smother Du Bois with an excess of fussy and cryptic attention. . . . This edition of Du Bois's *Correspondence* resembles nothing so much as a loosely concatenated prolegomenon to a biography, without the liability of a formal declaration. Great labor and great learning in bio-politico-historical ranges have gone into the [*Correspondence*]. But a bias has also gone into them." Cooke concedes that Aptheker's "effort will increase the appreciation due Aptheker for the way he helped, some decades ago, to raise and establish vital questions in Afro-American history and thought." Nonetheless, Cooke concludes, "it also leaves the impression that Aptheker has not substantially enlarged and refined his interests to keep in line with a field that is bursting with new controversy and fruit. Clearly Du Bois could have been more fully and more truly served."

But Redding, commenting in *Phylon*, a journal founded by Du Bois, remains undaunted in his praise of Aptheker's editing. "Only the editor's diligent research in dozens of private collections and libraries—at Atlanta University, Fisk, Harvard, Howard, Princeton, etc., etc.—and the public archives made possible the identification of the most significant letters to select. There is not an editorial comment nor an editorial footnote that is superfluous. There is not a single letter nor an exchange of letters that does not contribute to the reader's understanding of Du Bois himself or of the history of the times through which Du Bois lived and upon which he had a very considerable effect. . . . *The Correspondence of W.E.B. Du Bois* covers a century of history. What gives a special importance to the letters it contains is the light they shed on the *why* and *how* of this history and on the men and women who made it."

APTHEKER

CONTEMPORARY AUTHORS • New Revision Series, Volume 6

CA INTERVIEW

CA interviewed Herbert Aptheker at his office in San Jose, California, on May 28, 1981.

CA: *You've been a champion of the rights of the Black population for a long time. Did this interest begin with certain experiences you had as a young man?*

APTHEKER: It's not easy to convey this briefly because it's been so central a matter in my life. In the United States, people my age—I will be sixty-six this July—are products, in a very fundamental sense, of the Great Depression. During that period, when I was an adolescent, social consciousness was intensified. The most flagrant injustice in the 1930s was the oppression of Black people, which was open, naked, blatant, institutionalized, and in many areas legalized. This naturally attracted my attention.

There were certain specific, personal matters. For example, it happens that a very dear friend of my mother's was a Black woman whose name was Angelina Corbin. I became very attached to her. Later I learned, after she died, that she had been a figure of some consequence in terms of activity among Black people in Brooklyn where I grew up. Then certain things happened. I remember once returning from school—probably high school; I'm not even sure of that—and finding a crowd of people surrounding a truck on the bed of which was a cage. In the cage were men dressed in prisoner outfits of that period, black-and-white-striped suits with a ball and chain on their ankles. Someone was talking out of a kind of megaphone—we didn't have microphones in those days—and some people were handing out leaflets. This concerned the Angelo Herndon case, in which a young labor organizer, a Communist in his twenties, had been arrested and sentenced to death under a slave insurrection law of 1860 because he had organized and initiated a demonstration. He was sentenced to prison at the time and was awaiting death. This was a replica of where he was jailed, that was the idea. I remember I listened for a while—I don't remember what was said but I remember the occasion. I took one of the leaflets home to read and I asked my mother if these things happened, if this were true. Mother, who had been a pioneer organizer for the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, said that yes, it was true.

Something else happened soon after. I went on a long automobile trip with my father in the summer. We went down to Alexander City, Alabama, a very long drive in those days. We went through the heart of the South; it was my first visit. We were there for some weeks counting the driving, making a hundred or two hundred miles a day. This was during the depths of the Depression when it was bad in the North and bad for white people, but it was starvation in the South for Black people, absolute starvation. I had never seen this. We weren't rich but we weren't poor; I had never been hungry. Then there was the complete illiteracy and the complete lack of any knowledge. I remember I asked people who was president, and what was the name of the nearest city. Even things of this nature people didn't know. They just didn't know anything and were hungry. Then the open jim crow, that is the signs designating white and black rest rooms and drinking fountains, this kind of thing, was simply appalling.

When I came home from that trip, which lasted about five weeks, I remember I was doing a weekly column in the Erasmus Hall High School newspaper; and I devoted the column to the results of my studies of this matter. I studied the census in order to persuade myself that what I had seen was true, that it existed. I couldn't believe that people knew it existed, that

was the main point—not that it existed, but that people knew it existed, and it went on existing. I found that incredible. By the way, I still do. So I wrote about this, and I'm sure people stopped reading the column because it went on week after week after week. I called it "The Dark Side of the South." I graduated in 1933, so I was doing this probably in 1931 or 1932. I never stopped studying that question after that.

I did many other things, of course. For instance, in college, I wanted to be a historian; I told myself as a boy that I would like to write history, so I had the advantage of knowing what I wanted to do. History in those days was almost unbelievably racist. Here I was a student of history at Columbia. People like U. B. Phillips were the authority on what it meant to be a Black slave. I just knew that these things were not true, could not have been true. So that sort of gave me a lifetime work in history, an effort to investigate this and to find out what really happened. Of course Black writers had done this in part, people like Carter G. Woodson and W.E.B. Du Bois, but when you went to school in those days, you didn't learn that. This represented a great challenge, a great opportunity.

CA: *One of your main concerns over the years has been the lack of attention given to the Black in American history textbooks as well as in source readings. Do you think that a lot more space is being given to the Black now?*

APTHEKER: It's a great deal more than it was in the period we're talking about, the 1930s. There is the possibility of Black people themselves doing more. For instance, when I went to school at Columbia University in New York, it was a rarity to see a Black person in the classroom, and this is not true any longer. There is a book called *HOLDERS of Doctorates Among American Negroes* by a man named H. W. Greene, which appeared in 1946. It is a book of only three hundred pages. (I'm one of the people in the book—he just assumed that I was Black.) If you had a book now called *Black HOLDERS of the Ph.D.*, it would be the size of the *Columbia Encyclopedia*.

Then there was the outbreak of the great Black struggle of the late 1950s and 1960s, when you had what became a kind of fad of Black studies. This was never welcomed by those who dominate our society; they conceded because of the great pressure. But much of it has been undone, taken back. The fad is gone, publishers are no longer falling over themselves looking for books on Black subjects. The sales of such books have fallen precipitously. So while we're not back to where we were in the 1930s and 1940s, we're a good deal behind where we were in the mid-1960s.

CA: *Have Black studies programs fallen off a lot too?*

APTHEKER: Oh yes. There have been reports of that. I don't have the exact data but they have fallen off very much and enrollment has gone down. Institution after institution has terminated Black studies departments. At the least they've combined Black studies with other programs. This is a disastrous situation compared to conditions in the 1960s. This is part of the general right-wing drift, the whole campaign against affirmative action. Today affirmative action has been turned into a swearword. This has been accomplished rather deliberately, I think, in the last five years.

CA: *Are many Blacks who got degrees in American history in the 1960s and 1970s trying to rewrite the American past?*

APTHEKER: I wouldn't say many. Of course, with the Right drift, with the abandonment of Black studies and the closing of the publication market, you get discouraged. All this has

an obvious bad effect. But now you have some significant Black-run publications and institutions: the Institute for the Black World, for instance, in Atlanta, and the magazine *The Black Scholar*, the magazine *Freedom Ways*, the Johnson Publishing Company in Chicago, and the Black radio stations. There is this conscious effort, but it is very difficult and it is becoming more difficult; and therefore it is not encouraging to younger men and women to take up this effort.

CA: *Do you think, in the course of American history, that there have been any presidents who have really tried to help the cause of the Blacks?*

APTHEKER: I'm afraid in a conscious sense, probably no. Perhaps the person with the most sensitivity was Lincoln. This is evident, for instance, in his public speech denouncing lynching in 1837 and his welcoming Harriet Tubman and especially Frederick Douglass to the White House as people from whom he might learn. Douglass had great sensitivity and he reported a lack of racism in Lincoln. I don't think Lincoln was free of it, but the fact that Douglass would say a thing like that is really quite remarkable. I don't know of any other president who had this kind of sensitivity, however limited it was.

Of course there were advances made under Franklin D. Roosevelt. There were some advances forced out of Truman and, for that matter, Johnson during the 1960s. Johnson's speech at Howard University was probably the best speech on the subject made by a president. There is a fairly good book written recently by someone who did a study of presidents and racism. It's a pretty dismal record. There's a recent book also on Theodore Roosevelt, showing his racism and chauvinism toward women. So I'm afraid the record is not good.

CA: *You've spent a good deal of your life working on W.E.B. Du Bois's papers. Were they turned over to you?*

APTHEKER: In 1946, Dr. Du Bois asked if I would edit his works and his letters, and, of course, I said I would. From that period on, I worked on this and tried to get a publisher and was unable to for more or less obvious reasons. This continued. In 1961, he left for Africa and I took him and his wife to the airport, and he then turned over his correspondence and papers, including about a hundred thousand letters, to Mrs. Aptheker and me for our safekeeping. Files were sent to our house and we set to work on them. They were very disheveled and we spent thousands of hours putting them in order. We had them in our physical possession until 1973, when they were purchased from his widow—of course the legal possession I always considered to be that of Mrs. Du Bois. I visited her soon after he died, in 1964. I urged her to sell the papers and have a university properly take care of them. It was a terrible responsibility. They were in our basement and subject to fire, theft, and so forth. She finally agreed to sell them and it took some time, but the University of Massachusetts bought these papers. When that was completed I helped transfer the shipping of everything to Amherst, and all the papers now are at the University of Massachusetts—Amherst and they finally have been collated and indexed. In fact, the university there published a large book called *The Papers of Du Bois*, and they are now open to scholars.

CA: *According to a New Yorker piece in July, 1973, some of Du Bois's papers and books were still in Africa.*

APTHEKER: Not many. His main library he had taken with him, although he had sold a good many of his books, mainly fiction. Books that he wanted with him he took. The books,

by the way, are still there. After the coup in Ghana they've never been released. They're sealed, as I understand it, in a house, but they're still there. Some of the material Mrs. Du Bois was able to get out when she was forced to leave, and I saw some of it in her apartment in Cairo. Many of the remaining papers were gotten out just recently and are now at Amherst. His autobiography, which I edited in 1968, was posthumously published. I don't know how it reached me, sort of an underground process. The original manuscript is now in the library at Amherst. So that's something of that story.

The three volumes of correspondence have been published. Two more of his manuscripts have been published, one in 1973 called *The Education of Black People: Ten Critiques, 1906-1960*, a marvelous book, and a little while ago a beautiful book called *Prayers for Dark People* (1980), for which I wrote the introduction. I'm editing for Kraus-Thomson the complete published writings of Du Bois. There are to be forty volumes; twenty-five have appeared. That will be all of his books, articles, newspaper columns, studies for the government. There will be a separate volume of his poetry and short stories. There is already a published volume of his book reviews, selections from the magazines he edited like *Crisis*, *Horizon*, and *Phylon*.

CA: *I was astonished to read that his main work, Black Reconstruction, was never even reviewed in the American Historical Review.*

APTHEKER: That's correct. That gives you a good idea of the state of historiography at that time. And this although the book was published by a leading publisher, Harcourt Brace.

CA: *I'm sure that over the years it's been very difficult at times for you, because of your Marxist views, to speak on certain campuses. Is it now easier to obtain speaking engagements?*

APTHEKER: I'm not certain about that. It is easier than it was in the 1950s during the McCarthy period. Although even then, I set myself the task of breaking the ban against radical speakers which existed everywhere. I went from university to university and I did it. If I didn't do it the first time, I did it the second time, whether at the University of North Carolina or Buffalo or, for that matter, Berkeley. I broke the ban there in 1963 and now I find myself teaching at its law school. It's hard to believe.

But I want to make the point that although it was difficult, with effort it was possible, you could do it, although sometimes it was at the risk of life and limb. I was assaulted in Chapel Hill, for instance. In Latrobe, Pennsylvania, at Saint Vincent College, a Benedictine college, there was a mob of Ku Klux Klan and other gangsters which prevented me from speaking. They blocked the main highway. State troopers told the people at Saint Vincent's that they could not protect the college. I stayed at a motel, and the president of the college, the monsignor, personally took me to the college the next day, after they had canceled the public lecture. They had closed-circuit television at that college. He canceled all classes, and I was told that I could lecture to the entire student body all day. I did. I spoke for hours on all sorts of subjects, then there was a general questioning period, and then this monsignor drove me himself to the airport so that I could go home safely, something that I will never forget. It reflects the uniquely positive aspects of this country. We do have this kind of resistance and this simple courage. It's needless for me to say that the college authorities were quite opposed to my views. But they were absolutely livid at the attempt to prevent my appearance, which they considered an insult to their institution.

Today I very frequently speak, and often the auspices are quite distinguished. So it's a little different. It is easier, yes.

CA: Is a more positive attitude being taken toward Marxist studies?

APTHEKER: There still persists this necessity to struggle in this area. I am director of the American Institute for Marxist Studies, which has existed now for eighteen years. We established it in order to move from vituperation to conversation about Marxism. To a degree I think we've succeeded. But I still find it astonishing how much ignorance there is in circles where you'd least expect it. I recently reviewed a book on Alexis de Tocqueville in which the professor who wrote the introduction said that one of the great virtues of de Tocqueville was that he was free of "the virus of Marxism." Just think of that in terms of scholarship! This is a professor of some distinction at Yale. And it was absolutely gratuitous. Why bring Marx into a discussion of de Tocqueville at all? I don't think that would occur in any country other than the United States. I don't think it would occur in Turkey, and that a professor would write a thing like that! It is not as bad as in the 1950s, but it's still there, and of course with the present administration I imagine this will intensify.

BIOGRAPHICAL/CRITICAL SOURCES: Journal of Southern History, August, 1973; Choice, April, 1974; Journal of American History, December, 1974; American Historical Review, April, 1975, April, 1977; New Republic, February 19, 1977; Progressive, October, 1978; Book Forum, Volume IV, number 3, 1979; New York Times Book Review, January 7, 1979; Phylon, June, 1979, March, 1981; Michael Kammen, editor, The Past Before Us: Contemporary Historical Writing in the U.S., Cornell University Press, for American Historical Association, 1980.

—Interview by Walter W. Ross

* * *

<u>Professors</u>	<u>Issues</u>
12.Scott Nearing	Feb.,1981 & Aug.,1983
13.Shirley Nuss	Feb. & May, 1983 & Feb.,1984
14.Bertell Ollman	May & Aug., 1981
15.Melvin Rader	May & Aug., 1981
16.Walter Rodney	Feb.,1981
17.Bertrand Russell	Aug.,1982
18.Morris Schappes	Feb.,1982
19.Nancy Stoller Shaw	May/Aug., 1984
20.F. Joseph Smith	Nov.,1980 & May/Aug.,1981
21.Morris J. Starsky	Nov.,1983, Feb. & May/Aug.,1984
22.Charles Stastny	May & Aug., 1981
23. Katherine van Wormer	Feb. & May,1983
24. Merle Woo	Aug. & Nov., 1983, Feb.,1984, May/Aug.,1984

* * * * *

CASES OF ACADEMIC REPRESSION REVIEWED
IN ZEDEK (Nov.,1980-Aug.,1984)

<u>Professors</u>	<u>Issues</u>
1. Ron Aronson	May,1982
2. Herbert Aptheker	May/Aug.,1984
3.John Beecher	Feb.,1982
4.Barrows Dunham	May/Aug.,1981
5.Robert Dyal	Nov.,1980
6.Maija Blaubergrs	Feb.,1981
7.Alex Efthim	Nov.,1982
8. Pat Endress	Feb.,1981
9. R.M. Frumkin	Feb.,1982
10. Hans Kung	Feb.,1981
11. John Mecartney	Nov.,1982

SOME OF THE PERSONS WHO HAVE
ENDORSED THE AIMS OF SAPDF

- Scott Nearing(1883-1983)
Noam Chomsky
Benjamin Spock
Herbert Aptheker
Sara Cooper
Zolton Ferency
Roy Larson
Shirley Cereseto
Father Victor Weissler
Sarah Silver
Rick Kunnes
Kurt H. Wolff
Maryann Mahaffey
and many others.....

THE LITTLE PROFESSOR WHO STOOD UP TO THE NAZIS : A RELATIVELY UNKNOWN STORY ABOUT KÄTHE KOLLWITZ, THE SOCIALIST ARTIST

by R.M.Frumkin

The great depression of 1929 and the suffering of millions of unemployed in Germany helped make possible Adolph Hitler's becoming legally appointed chancellor (or prime minister) of Germany on January 30, 1933. Less than one month later, a friend of Hitler, Dr. Bernhard Rust was named Prussian Minister of Science, Art and Education.

One of Dr. Rust's first acts as lord over all kinds of artistic expression in Prussia was to threaten the closing of the Prussian Academy of Arts unless Käthe Kollwitz, art professor and artist, and Heinrich Mann, a novelist, were removed from the Academy's membership.

Since Hitler was appointed to the chancellorship and not elected to that position, to consolidate his power, he called for New Reichstag elections on March 5th. Käthe Kollwitz and her husband, Dr. Karl Kollwitz, a physician, joined Heinrich Mann and other courageous persons in an appeal to all Germans, particularly workers, to vote against the Nazis on March 5th. But the anti-Nazis were prevented from defeating Hitler because, about one week before the elections, the Nazis deliberately set the Reichstag building on fire, blaming the communists in order to create a fear of a communist takeover, and then unleashing a program of terrorism which did not really end until 1945.

Käthe Schmidt Kollwitz was born in Königsberg, Germany on July 8, 1867. At the time Dr. Rust made his demands for her removal from the Prussian Academy of Arts she was 65 years old and a world famous artist. It was in 1919, at the age of 52, that she has been awarded the title of Professor. She was earlier that year, the first woman ever elected to the Academy.

Kollwitz was, by all accounts, as superb a teacher as she was an artist. Her genuine, deep concern for the welfare of others, her passionate struggles against war and poverty, were always manifest in her relations with her students. On the Academy faculty some 13 years, a teacher loved and respected by everyone, she and Heinrich Mann were, nevertheless, forced to officially resign from the Academy in the Spring of 1933.

Prior to Hitler's intrusion in German politics, Kollwitz and other artists had enjoyed relative freedom and expression under the Weimar Republic. The unique contribution of the artists in Weimar Germany was to the school of expressionism, particularly its piercing social criticism of bourgeois society. Historian Marshall M. Dill in his GERMANY - A MODERN HISTORY (1961) stated that "Perhaps the work that will endure longest is the extremely compassionate drawing of Käthe Kollwitz whose delineation of the poor and downtrodden in their misery is unique."

Although officially dismissed from the Academy for her social criticism and socialism, Kollwitz continued secretly teaching her master students as the Academy Secretary looked the other way.

When Goering became top man in Prussia, several friends of Kollwitz requested that she be officially reinstated at the Academy.

Kollwitz and the Nazis -Frumkin (continued)

Goering was much impressed with the pleas for her official reinstatement, and moves were made to possibly honor these pleas, but Kollwitz resisted and rejected such an idea as an anathema to everything she believed in. That is, she would not, for a minute consider kowtowing to the Nazi leader or of recanting in order to officially get back into the Academy.

In May, 1933, the honorary President of the Academy, Max Liebermann, a fine painter and Jew, was also asked to resign from the Academy. Isolated by this expulsion, Kollwitz was one of the few non-Jews who had the courage to visit this old friend and colleague in spite of the real dangers involved. When Liebermann died in February, 1935, she was one of two non-Jews who had the courage to attend his memorial service.

Käthe Kollwitz made this poster for Central Germany Youth Day, Leipzig, August 2-4, 1924.



During 1936 a foreign journalist interviewed Kollwitz and another artist about the status of artists in Nazi Germany. Her candid comments were repeated in a foreign journal and then, most unfortunately, got back to the Nazi authorities. On July 13, 1936 two Gestapo officers came to her home and threatened her with placement in a concentration camp. The next day, one officer returned and requested that she write a statement repudiating the critical remarks which were attributed to her in the foreign journal. For the first time in her 69 years, Kollwitz did something very much against her principles; she complied with the Nazi request. Days of deep depression followed this reluctant act. She and her husband decided that if arrest and concentration camp seemed inevitable that they would commit suicide and informed the Gestapo of that intention. From that time onward, Käthe and Karl Kollwitz carried poison with them, just in case that moment of Nazi terror became a reality.

Kollwitz and the Nazis - Frumkin(continued)

After July 14, 1936 Kollwitz became one of those artists whose works the Nazis considered degenerate. Some of her works were confiscated and/or secretly sold by the Nazis to raise money for the Third Reich. However, because of her many friends and admirers inside and outside of Germany, most of her greatest works were preserved. Many of her works found refuge in the U.S.

Käthe Kollwitz, both as a mother and grandmother, experienced personally the tragedy of war so poignantly portrayed in her artwork. In World War I she lost one of her two sons, Peter, in 1914. Later, in World War II she lost her grandson, Peter (named after her son killed in World War I), in 1942.

When Dr. Rust became the Reich Minister of Science, Education and Popular Culture for all of Germany in April 30, 1934 he reflected Hitler's contempt for professors and the intellectual, academic life. All Jewish professors were removed from the universities and colleges and all professors who refused to accept the Nazi ideology. Surprisingly, not too many of the non-Jewish professors permitted to remain in their posts rebelled against the Nazis. And of those remaining in the universities and colleges, few dared to defy the Nazi authorities.

Kollwitz, in her own quiet, yet forceful way defied the Nazis at every opportunity and did survive the Nazi era. Practically, to the end of her life, although she deeply loved nature, her only subjects were human beings whom she loved even more. She is one of the few artists who created no landscapes or even still lifes. All of her works included human beings.

In an age dominated by the threat of friendly as well as outright fascism, the world needs more professors and artists who dare defy academic and other kinds of repression. In this context, the life and work of Käthe Kollwitz will long be remembered.

Suggested Reading

1. Bittner, Herbert. Käthe Kollwitz Drawings. N.Y.: A.S. Barnes, 1959.
2. Bonus-Jeep, Beate. Sechzig Jahre Freundschaft mit Käthe Kollwitz. Boppard, Germany: Karl Rauch Verlag, 1948.
3. Fanning, Robert Joseph. Käthe Kollwitz. Karlsruhe, Germany: George Wittenborn, 1956.
4. Klipstein, August. Käthe Kollwitz; Verzeichnis des graphischen Werkes. Bern: Klipstein & Co., 1955.
5. Klein, Mina C. & Klein, H. Arthur. Käthe Kollwitz: Life in Art. N. Y.: Schocken Books, 1975.
6. Kollwitz, Hans, ed. Briefe der Freundschaft. Munich: List Verlag, 1966.
7. Kollwitz, Hans, ed. The Diaries and Letters of Käthe Kollwitz. Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1955.
8. Kollwitz, Hans, ed. Ich sah die Welt mit Liebevollen Blicken. Hanover: Fackelträger-Verlag, 1968.
9. Kollwitz, Hans, ed. Käthe Kollwitz: Das plastische Werk. Hamburg: Wegner Verlag, 1967.

Kollwitz and the Nazis -Frumkin(continued)

Suggested Readings(continued)

10. Kollwitz, Kathe. Aus meinem Leben. Munich:List Verlag, 1958.
11. Kollwitz, Kathe. Twenty-One Late Drawings. Boston:Book & Art, 1970.
12. Nagel, Otto. Die Selbstbildnisse der Kathe Kollwitz. Berlin: Henschelverlag, 1965.
13. Nagel, Otto. Kathe Kollwitz. Greenwich, Conn.: New York Graphic Society, 1971.
14. Shikes, Ralph E. The Indignant Eye: The Artist as Social Critic in Prints and Drawings. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.

BACK TO SCHOOL (Note: This is reprinted from THE NATION, 9/5/77)

Virtually unreported by the U.S. press, El Salvador's National University campus was reopened in late June. For four years the sprawling grounds in downtown San Salvador had been occupied by the National Guard. The return of the campus to civilian control coincides with a significant resurgence of political activity in El Salvador—a resurgence which could become a crucial factor in the outcome of the war between the government of José Napoleón Duarte and leftist rebels.

On June 26, 1980, without warning, squads of heavily armed National Guardsmen overran the campus after the military/Christian Democratic junta charged that it was a hotbed of subversion. Dozens of students were wounded and at least fifty were killed in the resulting melee. The campus was sealed off, and a detachment of National Guardsmen took up residence in its halls and classrooms. During the next four years the troops methodically looted the university. They sold off valuable library collections, destroyed the archives, ransacked offices, disposed of research and laboratory equipment on the black market, carefully removed thousands of louvered windows and sold them to private construction firms, and stripped every last fixture, faucet and electrical switch from the school buildings. Overseeing the \$20 million sacking was Gen. Carlos Eugenio Vides Casanova, at the time commander of the National Guard and now President Duarte's Defense Minister.

But the university did not die. Its faculty held classes in rented rooms throughout the capital, even though professors were arrested and students disappeared. The posters calling for "Trial for the War Criminals" and the scratched-out murals of Che Guevara that still adorn the ravaged library are ghostly reminders of the university's importance as a spawning ground of resistance to a half-century of military rule.

On June 26, a few days after the occupation ended, a defiant graduation ceremony was held on campus. It was no accident that the one building that the school refurbished for the event contains the Law School auditorium, which in April 1980 was the birthplace of the Democratic Revolutionary Front, the center-left opposition political alliance

which has been forced underground and has since linked up with the guerrilla movement.

On the day of the ceremony the auditorium buzzed with political activity. Songs from revolutionary Nicaragua filled the air while more than a hundred sons and daughters of the middle class paid tribute to classmates who had been arrested or killed over the past years. Students hung red banners over the school fence calling for the release of political prisoners, and passed out leaflets criticizing President Duarte for not agreeing to unconditional talks with the guerrilla leaders.

University rector Miguel Angel Parada, a figure frequently threatened by death squads, addressed the ceremony and blasted the Duarte government for not providing funds for the reconstruction of the campus. Using the sort of challenging words that have not been heard at a public event in the capital in years, the rector vowed that the university would support and encourage political activity by the faculty and students. "What is opening up before us is not a period of celebration," he said, "but one of struggle, in which we will, without doubt, meet our traditional enemies head-on."

The reopening of the university campus may pose a dilemma for President Duarte, who has won the warm support of the U.S. Congress with his "moderate" rhetoric. As the campus returns to life, student organizations resurface and the political ferment resumes, how long will he be able to keep his promise to respect the school's autonomy? How long will he be able to tolerate a new urban opposition movement? Even as the graduation ceremony was taking place, thousands of civil service workers were on strike in San Salvador, marking the rejuvenation of union activity in national life.

In 1980 a powerful alliance of students and the working class brought about the bloody repression that served as a catalyst for the armed struggle. A reactivated alliance, linked to the growing military strength of the rebels, could be the combination that brings about the downfall of the Duarte government.

MARC COOPER AND GREG GOLDIN

Marc Cooper and Greg Goldin report on Central America for a number of national publications. Their in-depth interview with President José Napoleón Duarte will appear in the November issue of Playboy.

NANCY SHAW FIGHTS BACK

by Helen R. Samberg

Following a telephone conversation with Professor Nancy Stoller Shaw it is most compelling to become involved and supportive in her present struggle. At an upcoming hearing on October 5th a ruling will determine which court (federal or state) will hear her case, filed May 18, 1984, against the Regents of the University of California. Supporters of Shaw prefer the federal court under Title IX, although there are certain advantages to having a hearing in a state court.

On April 19, 1984 the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission had ruled that the denial of tenure to Professor Shaw was based (in part) on sex discrimination and her sexual orientation. The AAUP found both "grave sex discrimination and denial of due process in the proceedings." She has strong support from the Executive Council of the American Sociological Association who see political bias in the decision to fire her. Nancy Shaw is a sociologist who has the respect of her professional colleagues within and outside her discipline.



Nancy Shaw

This feminist, activist, denied academic freedom, has been on the faculty at the University of California at Santa Cruz since 1973. Her work has been primarily in women's studies. As a sociologist her concentration has been with the issue of social and political justice and women in prisons has been a special focus.

Since 1973 Professor Shaw has been appointed to a two-year tenure track professorship three times. Since applying for tenure she has been recommended for tenure by three separate review committees. All those recommendations have been unanimous, as was that of an ad hoc committee. Incredibly, the Chancellor at the University of California at Santa Cruz, namely, Dr. Robert L. Sinsheimer, obviously bent on ousting Shaw, actually appointed a second ad hoc committee and issued, in print, defaming, damaging judgmental statements, steamrolling over national and international supportive professional peers of status as an academic network of progressive social scientists who will fervently support any member of this club, that is, her kind of people. This kind of administrative bias makes even the interpretation of the outside letters of support for Shaw difficult to interpret with any kind of objectivity. Despite knowledgeable sociologists' testimony, Dr. Sinsheimer called upon a biologist to be the determining judge of Shaw's qualifications for tenure. That biologist claimed, while disregarding the overwhelming evidence in her favor, that Nancy Shaw was not sufficiently scholarly and her work was more like that of a "reporting recorder", a journalist, than that of a "real scholar." This evaluation was made in spite of the fact that Shaw, who has been a post-doctoral fellow at Yale University, has many awards for her work on the feminist movement, on issues of equality and justice.

(continued on next page)

Shaw Fights Back-Samberg (continued)

This short article is but a brief introduction to the story of Nancy Shaw's struggle. More detailed accounts will appear in future issues of ZEDEK. In the meantime it is practical and vital for us to request financial support for her. She is now incurring heavy expenses in her fight for justice and her job. Please make contributions to: The Nancy Shaw Legal Defense Fund (NSLDF)
347 Plateau Avenue
Santa Cruz, California 95060.

* * * * *

New Books by SAPDF AuthorsTHE DIALECTICS OF DISASTER: A PREFACE TO HOPE

by RONALD ARONSON ^{L/}

Published by Schocken Books, 200 Madison Avenue,
New York, N.Y. 10016.

Price: \$9.95.

329 Pages

" Is there reason to hope today? With this question Ronald Aronson confronts the sources of today's widely shared sense of cynicism and crisis: Auschwitz, the Stalin dictatorship, the Vietnam War and the threat of a final nuclear catastrophe.

In a series of interlinked studies based on deep historical research, Aronson explores the intentional structures and social sources of the Nazi, Stalinist and bourgeois-democratic catastrophes. In each case he asks and answers the central yet most perplexing question: Why? In the process he develops a new insight into our disastrous century, which insists on the central role of morality yet rigorously traces the social logic of the unreason that dominates the world. This unusual synthesis of history, philosophy and political theory then presents sustained meditations on the dynamics of power and evil today.

Moving from the recent past to the present, Aronson used the concept of the dialectics of disaster to illuminate the deep structure of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the technological madness of the nuclear arms race. In a moving conclusion, he returns to his opening question, pointing to the only way of recreating an authentic hope beneath the Doomsday mushroom cloud. Achieving a unique moral, intellectual and political balance in areas where hysteria and cynicism are endemic, THE DIALECTICS OF DISASTER is a major contribution to our understanding of the twentieth century."

L/ Aronson's struggle with academic repression in May, '82 ZEDEK.

The Morris J. Starsky Case : Part IIITHE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STARSKY CASEby R.M. Frumkin

When the political orientation of modern nations shifts from democratic to less democratic behavior, one of the first social institutions to which repressive measures are applied is education, particularly higher education. This change was clearly evident following the fall of the Weimar Republic and the rise of the Nazis. It has been evident during periods of American history when conservatives have had the key centers of power.

May, 1970 was a critical month in which anti-democratic behavior dramatically exploded in the United States with the Kent State Massacre. In cold blood, four college students were murdered by government forces and made object lessons for those who dare question and criticize U.S. governmental policies. In June of 1970 Morris J. Starsky, a tenured assistant professor of philosophy at the Arizona State University, Tempe (located in metropolitan Phoenix), became another victim when he was dismissed for "misconduct." It was the kind of "misconduct" the opposition to which helped Ronald Reagan become governor of California in 1966 when he bitterly opposed the dissidents at the University of California, Berkeley, and other California campuses.

Exactly what was the nature of Morris Starsky's "misconduct"? Why was he really dismissed? What does his case, reviewed in the November, 1983 and February, 1984 issues of ZEDEK, teach us about academic repression?

Morris Starsky became a social activist very early in his life. He was involved in Leftist demonstrations in his early teens. When he came to Arizona State University he had had a solid background in the Civil Rights Movement and easily moved into the anti-Vietnam War Movement as it gained momentum. As early as 1965, according to Freedom of Information Act records, the FBI targeted him for surveillance. However, as soon as it was learned that he had very "mistakenly" been granted tenure and then had the audacity in 1968 to support the Social Workers Party presidential and vice-presidential candidates, the FBI decided to use its counterintelligence techniques against him. Thus, when Morris Starsky became an SWP elector, he signed his academic death warrant. From that point on, the FBI was apparently able to reach particular members of the Arizona Board of Regents (the ultimate decisionmakers on matters of higher education in Arizona, that is, public higher education) and get them to request that the President of Arizona State University (ASU) take action against Starsky. The grounds for such action have been reviewed in detail in the November, 1983 and February, 1984 issues of ZEDEK. Briefly, the charges against him come under the general category of misconduct, that is, such as failing to exercise "appropriate restraint," "observe University regulations," "show respect



Morris J. Starsky

Starsky Case:Part III(continued)

for the opinions of others," be "objective in his professional judgment of colleagues," observe "AAUP principles of professional ethics," "further public understanding of academic freedom," etc.

In January,1970 the ASU President was advised by the Regents, against the wishes of an ad hoc faculty committee and his own personal wishes, to investigate the charges made against Starsky. During the Spring of 1970 when the Faculty Hearing Committee was examining the charges against Starsky, as a part of their Cointelpro operation, the FBI sent an anonymous letter to the Committee attempting to turn them against Starsky. To the credit of the Committee members, they recommended that Starsky not be dismissed and the ASU President accepted their decision. However, the Board of Regents, the people with the power, did not accept the recommendation and dismissed Starsky on June 10,1970.

There are, in the case of Morris J. Starsky, serious violations of civil liberties, constitutional and academic rights.

First Amendment ViolationsA. Freedom of Association

Morris Starsky became openly associated with the Socialist Workers Party(SWP) in 1968 when he became a presidential elector (delegate). He became a member of the SWP early in 1970. The First Amendment to the U.S.CONSTITUTION guarantees Starsky the right of association, the right to join any organization he wishes. The Arizona Board of Regents denied Starsky that right when, in cooperation with the FBI they set out to deprive him of his tenured professorship at ASU. Although there was no official list of subversive organizations, that is, an Attorney Generals List of Subversive Organizations, which existed at that time, the FBI, with its Cointelpro operations harassed persons belonging to organizations which it believed were "subversive." If Starsky had not been a member of the SWP, he might today have still been on the ASU faculty. The February,1984 issue details Starsky's case as a plaintiff in the SWP v. Attorney General of the U.S. suit still in the federal courts. A comprehensive book on the SWP class suit against the U.S. government which began in 1973 may be found in the Political Defense Fund's SECRET POLICE ON TRIAL (N.Y.:1981).

B. Freedom of Speech

Morris Starsky is a socialist and social activist. He has been an activist since his teens. In speaking out on a number of controversial issues he has become the target of federal surveillance. As an American citizen, however, he is guaranteed by the U.S. CONSTITUTION the right of free speech. The Arizona Board of Regents denied him this right when they allowed themselves to be influenced by the FBI and dismissed Starsky against the recommendations of his faculty peers and the President of ASU that he not be dismissed. For a detailed account of the Starsky struggle at ASU by an ASU colleague of Starsky's see Thomas F. Hault's THE MARCH TO THE RIGHT(Cambridge,Mass: Schenkman,1972).

Starsky Case: Part III (continued)Fifth Amendment ViolationsDue Process

There were many violations of due process in the course of Starsky's dismissal. Some of the violations, some of the most important ones, are discussed below.

A. Decisionmakers Biased

Fundamental to due process is the requirement that the decisionmakers as parties to a fair hearing must be unbiased. In permitting the FBI to influence their decision to initiate dismissal proceedings and then actually dismissing Starsky, the Arizona Board of Regents grossly violated Starsky's right to unbiased decisionmakers. Such bias among Board of Regents members throughout the USA has been well-documented in Bettina Aptheker's THE ACADEMIC REBELLION IN THE UNITED STATES (Secaucus, N.J.: Citadel Press, 1972). That is, most Boards are composed of anti-socialist, anti-activist, politically Conservative capitalist class of men, generally speaking. The Arizona Board of Regents did not differ significantly from that kind of membership configuration.

B. Decisionmakers Ignored the Recommendations of Starsky'sPeers

Another fundamental aspect of due process is that a person's peers examine and evaluate the charges against him and make their recommendations to the decisionmakers. The decisionmakers are then generally obligated to accept the recommendations of the person's peers unless, for adequate reasons, they call for another hearing. Starsky's peers recommended that he not be dismissed and the Board ignored that recommendation. Since they disagreed with the peer recommendation, they should have called for another hearing to re-examine and re-evaluate the evidence and the decisionmakers should have presented the Faculty Hearing Committee with the specific things in the peer recommendation that they took issue with. This obligation is also an obligation which the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) regards as a significant one. While the Arizona Board of Regents officially paid lip service to that AAUP and constitutional obligation, in Starsky's case they obviously ignored it. Such an action on the part of the Board makes a mockery of the essence of due process. It is as if the jury finds a defendant innocent of murder and recommends his release and the judge decides he is guilty and moves that he be executed without calling for a new trial and examining new evidence which might support his disagreement with the jury's decision. Unfortunately, Starsky was subject to the equivalent of execution, that is, he was dismissed from his tenured professorship and virtually blacklisted from regular college teaching in the U.S. for the rest of his life.

C. The Right of Discovery was Denied

The right of discovery makes it possible for a person seeking justice to have access to all sources of evidence against him. Since the FBI documents, made known later (years after his dismissal) were not made available to Starsky at the time of his

Starsky Case: Part III(continued)

hearings, that right was grossly denied. It is impossible to defend oneself against "evidence" one is unaware of. The conspiracy between the FBI and the Arizona Board of Regents is one of the darker pages in the history of academic repression in the USA.

D. Property Rights in ASU Professorship Denied

For the above and many other grounds, Starsky was denied the right to retain his tenured professorship - a property right - without due process. Following his dismissal he was essentially blacklisted from holding any regular, full-time professional position in an American college or university. Now, having developed a health problem, partly as a result of the stress faced since 1970, Starsky faces even greater financial burdens.

As many of the past issues of ZEDEK have demonstrated, the physical, social psychological, and economic aspects of academic repression are often tragic in their consequences. For example, F. Joseph Smith, a tenured professor dismissed from Kent State in 1973, has still been unable to obtain a position in the academic world in spite a reputation as^a competent scholar in his areas of specialization. There are, unfortunately, many others in the same kind of predicament. Too often financially and academically secure supporters of the victims of academic repression overlook some of the personal pain inherent in the denial of rights to one's job.

Academic RightsAAUP Violation I.

The 1958 AAUP STATEMENT ON PROCEDURAL STANDARDS calls for "the governing board, if it does not sustain the decision of the hearing committee, to return the decision to the committee with objections specified and give the committee opportunity to reconsider." The Arizona Board of Regents was made aware of this procedural requirement but chose to ignore and, consequently, violate it.

AAUP Violation II.

Governing boards of universities are review bodies with regard to dismissal proceedings. In the Starsky case the Arizona Board of Regents twice involved itself in initiating dismissal proceedings against Starsky. This was clear violation of the AAUP's STATEMENT ON GOVERNMENT OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES. The task of initiating dismissal proceedings belongs to university administrative and faculty staff and ^{not} to governing boards.

AAUP Violation III.

According to the AAUP 1940 STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE, "teachers on a continuous appointment ...who are dismissed for reasons not involving moral turpitude should receive their salaries for at least one year from the notification of dismissal." Starsky was granted only 60 percent of his annual salary even though he was entitled to 100 percent. This constitutes another violation of AAUP principles.

Starsky Case: Part III(continued)AAUP Violation IV

Most of the specific charges regarding which the Arizona Board of Regents found "evidence" involved Starsky's right to free speech. In basing their decision largely on this behavior they violated his right to academic freedom under the AAUP 1940 STATEMENT ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE as well as the First Amendment to the U.S. CONSTITUTION.

AAUP Violation V

Perhaps the most serious violation of AAUP principles was the FBI's Cointelpro operations which intruded on Starsky's right to academic freedom and tenure. To this day the FBI agents responsible for this invasion of Starsky's rights have not been identified, questioned, and, therefore, made accountable for their violations of his rights.

In spite of all the personal obstacles Starsky has had to contend with in the past 14 years, he continues to be involved with the Socialist Workers Party and its newspaper, in Central American solidarity work, and in speaking on political topics. As one of the principal plaintiffs in the Socialist Workers Party v. Attorney General of the U.S. he is still much involved in the continued struggle to preserve the right to freedom of association and expression.

The articles done on the Starsky case by ZEDEK were undertaken because it is one of the most significant academic freedom cases of our times. ZEDEK will try to keep readers informed of any new developments in the case.

#####

Editor's Note: To get in touch with Starsky please address letters c/o SAPDF, 19329 Monte Vista Drive, Detroit, Michigan 48221, USA. The letters will be forwarded to him.

STARSKY AND KOLLWITZ

There is a chilling parallel between the seemingly unrelated stories of Käthe Kollwitz and Morris Starsky. Both were socialists and social activists in their own special ways. Both lost secure positions in which they were competent professors because of repressive, conservative decisionmakers holding power in their respective societies. Kollwitz was dismissed shortly after Hitler came into power, following the collapse of the Weimar Republic. Starsky was dismissed when Richard Nixon, taking advantage of a discontented, divided country, became President of the U.S. in 1968 and supported the FBI's Cointelpro (Counterintelligence Program) operations. The program actively worked to undermine the activities of dissident political groups and the Socialist Workers Party was one of those groups targeted for a program of subversion against domestic critics.

#####

SAPDF NOW SEEKING NEW SUPPORTERS TO HELP FINANCE ITS STATED AIMS

SAPDF, a non-profit foundation established in 1980 to defend social activist professors whose constitutional and civil rights have been violated, is now seeking more funds through its program of annual memberships. There are four basic memberships: Individual, Supporting, Sponsor, and Patron. There is also a special membership for Students, Seniors, and Additional Members of a Household. All four basic members receive the official journal ZEDEK plus all special publications (reports, monographs, etc.) as they appear. The special members receive ZEDEK only. The stated aims of SAPDF can be found on pages 1 and 2 of the November, 1980 issue of ZEDEK. Since individual and institutional subscriptions do not fully pay for the current production and distribution costs of ZEDEK we have been reluctantly forced to raise subscription rates. To fulfill its many significant aims, SAPDF needs the wide support of interested and concerned members. If you are not already a member of SAPDF please seriously consider becoming one. Our survival depends on your fullest support.

SOME OF THE MEN AND WOMEN WHO HAVE ENDORSED THE AIMS OF SAPDF

- Scott Nearing ... Noam Chomsky ... Benjamin Spock ... Herbert Aptheker ...
- Sara Cooper ... Zolton Ferency ... Roy Larson ... Shirley Cereseto ...
- Father Victor Weissler ... Sarah Silver ... Bertell Ollman ... Thomas Lough ...
- Laura Boss ... John Snider ... Rick Kunnes ... Kurt H. Wolff ...
- Maryann Mahaffey ... Ron Aronson ... Alex Efthim ... Gerald Coles ...
- Murray Jackson ... Richard Weiss ... Betty Lanham ... Morris Schappes ...
- Kathleen Calahan ... Jim Messerschmidt ... Shirley Nuss ... Milton Tambor ...
- Steven Shank ... Gordon Fellman and many others.

Registration Form

Name: _____

Address: _____

Zip: _____

Membership -	_____ \$10 (Student, Senior, Additional Member of Household)	
includes Zedek	_____ \$20 (Individual)	_____ \$150 (Sponsor)
	_____ \$50 (Supporter)	_____ \$200 or more (Patron)

Make all contributions payable to the Social Activist Professors Defense Foundation or S.A.P.D.F. and return to: 19329 Monte Vista, Detroit, Michigan 48221 U.S.A.

Endorser Statement

I, _____, wish to become an endorser of the Social Activist Professors Defense Foundation.

Signed: _____ Date: _____
(complete signature)

Names & Addresses of Other Potential Members and/or Endorsers

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

Thank you for your recommendations.