

A Statement by Charles A. Beard

IT has been insinuated by certain authorities of Columbia University that I resigned in a fit of unjustified petulance, and I, therefore, beg, to submit the following statement:

1. My first real experience with the inner administration of the university came with the retirement of Professor John W. Burgess. For sometime before his withdrawal, his work in American constitutional law had been carried by Professor X and it was the desire of the members of the faculty that the latter should be appointed Ruggles Professor to succeed Mr. Burgess. But Mr. X had published a book in which he justified criticism of the Supreme Court as a means of bringing our constitutional law into harmony with our changing social and economic life. He was therefore excluded from the Ruggles professorship. It was given to Mr. W. D. Guthrie, a successful corporation lawyer, and a partner of one of the trustees of the University. It was understood that Mr. Guthrie should give one lecture a week for one semester each year, in return for the high honor. Mr. Butler is constantly saying that all matters relating to appointment, fitness, and tenure are left to the appropriate faculties, or words to this effect. As a matter of plain fact the Faculty of Political Science as such was not consulted in advance in the selection of the Ruggles professor. The whole affair was settled by backstairs negotiation, and it was understood by all of us who had any part in the business that no person with progressive or liberal views would be acceptable. Mr. Guthrie was duly appointed. Of his contributions to learning I shall not speak, but I can say that he did not attend faculty meetings, help in conducting doctors' examinations, or assume the burdens imposed upon other professors. This was the way in which the first important vacancy in the Faculty of Political Science was filled after my connection with the institution.

2. My second experience with the administration of the University came in 1916. On April 21st of that year I delivered an address before the National Conference of Community Centers in which I advocated the use of the schools as the centers for the discussion of public questions. A few weeks before, a speaker at one of the school forums was alleged to have said, "To Hell with the Flag," and for that reason a number of persons had urged the closing of school centers altogether. Indeed, some of the speakers at the above mentioned conference advocated a sort of censorship for all school forums. In my address I merely took the reasonable and moderate view that the intemperance of one man should not drive us into closing the schools to others. The reports in the newspapers, with one exception, were fairly accurate. But one sensational sheet accused me of approving the sentiment, "To Hell with the Flag." Dr. Butler, who had had large experience with frenzied journalism quite rightly took the view that I had been the victim of the headline writer and advised me to do my best to correct the wrong impression and then forget it. I immediately wrote to all of the papers and sought to remove the misunderstanding that had arisen.

Nevertheless I was summoned before the committee on education of the board of trustees. I complied because I wanted to clear up any wrong impressions which the members entertained concerning the nature of my address before the Community Center conference.

As soon as the committee of the trustees opened the inquiry I speedily disposed of the "flag incident," by showing that I had said nothing that could be construed as endorsing in any way the objectionable language in question. No one doubted my word. Indeed I had available abundant testimony from reliable men and women who had heard the address. The record was thus soon set straight.

The inquiry as to the flag incident being at an end I prepared to leave the room when I was utterly astonished to have Mr. Bangs and Mr. Coudert launch into an inquisition into my views and teachings. For half an hour I was "grilled" by these gentlemen. Dr. Butler and certain colleagues from the Faculty of Political Science (who were present at the inquisition) made no attempt to stop the proceedings. Mr. Coudert, who had once privately commended my book on the Constitution as "admirably well done," and opening up "a most fertile field," denounced my teachings in vigorous language, in which he was strongly seconded by Mr. Bangs. I realize now that I should have refused to remain in the room, but I was taken unaware and stunned by the procedure. When the inquisitors satisfied themselves, the chairman of the committee ordered me to warn all other men in my department against teachings "likely to inculcate disrespect for American institutions. I repeated my order to my colleagues who received it with a shout of derision, one of them asking me whether Tammany Hall and the pork barrel were not American institutions!

I reported to my colleagues in the Faculty of Political Science that I had been subjected by the committee of the trustees to a "general doctrinal inquisition," and urged them, at an informal meeting, to establish a rule that a professor should be examined in matters of opinion only by his peers, namely men of standing in his profession. Several caucuses of the Faculty were held and it was generally agreed that the proceedings of the trustees were highly reprehensible. Action doubtless should have been taken by the Faculty at the time if we had not been told by Dean Woodbridge that "the trustees had learned their lesson and that such an inquisition would never happen again." We were also informed that some of the trustees were "after" President Butler for his pacifist writings and affiliations and that if the Faculty took a firm stand in matters of doctrinal inquisition an open conflict might ensue. In a long conversation President Butler urged me to drop the whole "miserable business" and go on about my work.

For the sake of "peace" I consented. I could not forget, however, the cases of Professor Kendrick and Dr. Fraser who had been haled before the committee of the trustees on the trivial charge that they had criticized Plattsburg and military discipline at a student meeting some time early in 1916. Their cases I regarded as peculiarly open to objection because they were not even accused of saying anything that was indecent or vulgar or unpatriotic. Nevertheless, I dropped the whole matter on the assurance that such an inquisition would not happen

again and that the trustees "had learned their lesson."

3. Though I did not agree with some of my exuberant colleagues that a "great battle for academic freedom had been won," I was ready to abide by their decision. Then, to our utter astonishment, the trustees at their March meeting in 1917 gave to the press a set of resolutions instructing a committee "to inquire and ascertain" whether certain doctrines were being taught in the University. President Butler, in whose name we had been assured that no such inquisition would ever happen again, avoided the issue by taking a vacation and leaving the Faculties to deal with the situation.

The action of the Faculty of Political Science was prompt. An informal meeting was held at which a resolution in the following tenor was unanimously adopted: "Whereas the resolution of the trustees by its very terms implies a general doctrinal inquisition, insults the members of the Faculty by questioning their loyalty to their country, violates every principle of academic freedom, and betrays a profound misconception of the true function of the university in the advancement of learning, *Be it resolved* that we will not individually or collectively lend any countenance to such an inquiry." The trustees were forced to abandon their plan for a general inquisition. Indeed, when they learned of the spirit of the Faculty of Political Science and other faculties, they hastily disclaimed any intention of making a "doctrinal inquiry"—as their resolution of March, 1917, clearly implied.

It was agreed that such matters should be handled in coöperation with a committee of nine representing the faculties.

4. Notwithstanding this promise of coöperation on the part of the trustees and the committee of nine representing the teaching force, the trustees ignored the recommendations of that committee in the cases of Professors Dana and Cattell and dismissed these gentlemen summarily in the autumn of 1917, after wrongfully charging them with grave crimes of treason and sedition. Professor John Dewey resigned from the committee of nine and the body which was to safeguard the interests of the professors collapsed in ignominy.

5. Some time before Professors Cattell and Dana were expelled, another professor was summarily thrown out of the University without warning or trial. No reasons for his expulsion were advanced and a polite inquiry addressed by his colleagues to President Butler asking for information remained unanswered.

6. Dr. Leon Fraser was an instructor in Politics in Columbia College. With this office he combined that of assistant to Dean Keppel and Dr. Butler in the Association for International Conciliation. Dr. Fraser was assigned the task of organizing courses in colleges throughout the country on pacifism and international conciliation. In other words, he was paid by these gentlemen to engage in pacifist propaganda. In a moment of youthful enthusiasm, early in 1916, Dr. Fraser made some critical remark about the military camp at Plattsburg. For this he was haled before a committee of the trustees. A year later, namely, in the spring of 1917, my department was warned not to re-nominate Dr. Fraser for re-appointment because he was not acceptable to Mr. Bangs, one of the trustees.

In spite of our orders we did re-nominate Dr. Fraser, but before action could be taken by the trustees, he, along with other instructors was dropped, on the assumption that the war would reduce materially the number of students in the college. But not content with dropping him, Mr. Butler informed the College authorities that in case the attendance in the college in the autumn warranted the appointment of additional instructors, under no circumstances should Dr. Fraser be re-nominated. In truth, therefore, if not in theory, Dr. Fraser was expelled from the College without notice or hearing. In view of the fact that Mr. Fraser had been inspired by Mr. Butler and Mr. Keppel to engage in pacifist propaganda and had been paid by them for doing it, it seemed to me that they should at least have demanded and insisted upon having a full and fair hearing of the charges against their youthful adherent, especially as those charges grew out of his "pacifist" teachings.

7. We are informed by Dr. Butler that nominations for appointment and promotions come from the Faculties. Such may be the theory, but it is the practice for the trustees and president to warn the committees in charge of appointments and promotions against recommending "unacceptable" persons. For example, when the committee on instruction of the Faculty of Political Science, of which I was a member, was considering promotions last spring, it was informed at the outset by "the committee of one on rumor from the president's office" that "certain of the trustees" would not approve the promotion of Professor Y because he had used "disrespectful language" in speaking of the Supreme Court. Professor Y was not recommended for promotion and the trustees could proudly say that they had not rejected a faculty recommendation!

Mr. Butler cannot conceive of a scholar's entertaining progressive ideas. Once, in asking me to recommend an instructor to a neighboring college, he distinctly pointed out that a man of "Bull Moose" proclivities would not be acceptable.

8. Early in October, 1917, I was positively and clearly informed by two responsible officers of the University that another doctrinal inquisition was definitely scheduled for an early date. It was the evident purpose of a small group of the trustees (unhindered, if not aided, by Mr. Butler) to take advantage of the state of war to drive out or humiliate or terrorize every man who held progressive, liberal, or unconventional views on political matters in no way connected with the war. The institution was to be reduced below the level of a department store or factory and I therefore tendered my resignation.

I make no claims in behalf of academic freedom, though I think they are worthy of consideration. I have merely held that teachers should not be expelled without a full and fair hearing by their peers, surrounded by all of the safeguards of judicial process. Professors in Columbia University have been subjected to humiliating doctrinal inquisitions by the trustees, they have been expelled without notice or hearing, and their appointment and promotion depend upon securing, in advance, the favor of certain trustees. Without that favor scholarship and learning avail nothing.

These facts I submit to the candid and impartial reader. I believe that they constitute a full and unanswerable indictment of the prevailing methods at Columbia University under the administration of Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler.

CHARLES A. BEARD.

CORRESPONDENCE

Sir Gilbert Murray's Reviewer

SIR: As I care a good deal what The New Republic thinks of me, I will venture to do what is generally an unwise thing—to remonstrate on one point with your reviewer of my book, *War, Faith and Policy*.

Only on one point, where I think he has missed my purpose.

He collects a few passages in which I praise the British tradition in politics, appeal to old English Liberalism, or describe certain kinds of misconduct as "un-English," and he easily makes the impression that I am indulging in a bout of Jingo self-glorification. I would like him to remember two things; first, that these essays were written for an English audience which naturally does not take such an unfavorable view as he does of the English character; secondly, that these appeals are always made with a definite purpose, with which he would, I am sure, sympathize.

There are two horrors threatening us in this war; one is defeat by Germany, the other is national degradation and brutalization. I try to work as hard against one as against the other. And surely the best way to induce people not to sink to their lowest is to show faith in their highest. When you yourself, sir, have to protest against some symptom of war-fever—reprisals on the innocent, war-after-the-war or the like—are you sure you will never appeal to the pride of the American people in their own traditions, and say to them plainly, "You are too great and generous a people to descend to these dishonors"? At any rate, if you do, I shall not blame you as a Jingo boaster.

Or will your reviewer answer that America has a right to be proud of herself whereas England should only be ashamed? I wonder.

GILBERT MURRAY.

London, England.

The Facts as to Women in War Industries

SIR: The article on Women in War Industries which appeared in your columns last week contains a number of mis-statements which need correction. Comment on labor matters in The New Republic usually shows so much insight and sympathetic understanding, that I am the more at pains to correct the most obvious errors and the resulting misapprehension of the actual facts.

It is true as the writer states that the government has been incredibly slow since the war began in gathering official information on the condition of women wage earners and in leading the way to their effective employment, although the experience of Great Britain and other war-countries had already proved how extensively the war industries would depend upon their labor. Even at this time there is no central agency effectively distributing these workers, providing the industrial training that is needed, and supervising the conditions of labor. But it is alto-

gether misleading for the article to suggest remedies based on a misconception of the function of the various government departments and other agencies.

The writer, for instance, makes the extraordinary statement that "the Department of Labor has decided to refuse government contracts to homeworkers but nothing is done to enforce this ruling." She is evidently ignorant of the fact that this department of the federal government gives out no contracts for manufacturing war supplies, and has never made or ceased to make contracts with homeworkers. In another connection she naively remarks that "Mrs. Florence Kelly has started to investigate uniform making."

The truth behind these two statements is that since last August the Board of Control of Labor Standards for Army Clothing, of which Mr. Louis E. Kirstein is chairman and Mrs. Florence Kelly secretary, has been actively at work under the Quartermaster-General.

In giving the reasons for establishing this Board, Secretary Baker said:

"The government cannot permit its work to be done under sweatshop conditions, and it cannot allow the evils widely complained of to go uncorrected. Only through the establishment of such a body as the Board of Control now created will the government be assured that army clothing is manufactured under recognized industrial standards and in an atmosphere of good-will between manufacturers and operatives. This alone will assure fit clothing and its prompt delivery for army needs."

It is now an accomplished fact that in New York City, the great center of the industry, no uniforms are being made in sweatshops.

The writer comments also on the work of the National Committee on Women in Industry and its subcommittees saying that "they are hampered . . . because their function is advisory to the government" and that they therefore cannot "openly denounce night work for women" in one of the navy yards.

As its secretary I wish to explain that the committee has never been in a position where it could not express its disapproval of such flagrant violation of hygienic safeguards as requiring women to work at night. Many months ago, in its standards for work on war supplies, it recommended to the government that women should not be so employed, and that they should be allowed at least eight hours rest at night. The subcommittee on Foreign-Born Women sent out bulletins to the foreign language press containing the standards of the committee in order to inform these women of the steps being taken for their protection. But this committee did not, as this article charges, urge them to refuse to work on night shifts.

The article further concludes that the committees are "hampered by a lack of coöperation among themselves." "Orthodox trade unionists wish action to come chiefly from the organized workers, while social workers want government protection." It should be stated that there has never been a difference of opinion in the committee regarding its program. On the contrary, there is entire agreement that the government, as employer, should above all others establish model industrial conditions. The trade union members are as eager as the social workers to have the government establish such conditions in its own plants, and also stipulate that similar standards shall be adopted by private manufacturers having contracts from the government. Organized labor agrees with this policy. It has representation on the adjustment committees which are being created under the terms of the contracts whenever

Copyright of New Republic is the property of New Republic and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.