Regular meeting
President White presiding

September 20, 1954
9:10 A.M.

Minute 1: The Minutes of the meeting of June 2, 1954, were approved as read.

Minute 2: The President welcomed back those Faculty members who had been on leave, and introduced new members of the Faculty.

Minute 3: Vice-President MacIntosh announced that the class of 1958 will consist of 114 or perhaps 115 students, and relayed - apparently with some doubts - the opinion of others that this seems to be the best Freshman class ever. Total enrolment is expected to be about 459.

Minute 4: The Faculty expressed its sorrow at the death of Lester Haworth, and asked the secretary to prepare a minute in this connection.

Minute 5: The Dean hopefully proposed a change with regard to courses placed on the Registrar's list. He explained that it seems impracticable at the end of the college year to raise first-semester grades to 60 in cases where students had actually failed the first semester's work, but completed the second semester's work with a passing grade, and recommended instead that such students be merely given credit for the first semester, without raising the respective grade. The Dean was directed to consult further with the Faculty members opposed to such a change.

There were reports from several Faculty committees and various announcements.

Adjourned 9:55 A.M.

Gerhard Friedrich
Secretary
Regular meeting
President White presiding

October 4, 1954
4:10 P.M.

Minute 1: The Minutes of the meeting of September 20, 1954, were approved as corrected.

Minute 2: A special minute in memory of Lester C. Haworth (see Annex 1) was approved, and the secretary directed to forward a copy to Lester Haworth's family.

Minute 3: Dean Cadbury explained, for the information of the Faculty, a recent decision by the Academic Council to waive the foreign language requirements in the case of a student apparently afflicted with a constitutional deficiency in this respect, as indicated by repeated failures in foreign-language courses.

Minute 4: The President shared with the Faculty general comments made by last year's graduates to the effect that they would have welcomed: even more strenuous intellectual training during their four years at Haverford; more careful organization of class discussions; more deliberate building in advanced courses on the work of earlier semesters; and closer personal relationship between Faculty members and students.

After several announcements the regular meeting closed at 5:05 P.M.

Minute 5: Following last year's example, Paulding Phelps, President of the Students' Council, and other members of the Council and of the Honor System Committee offered explanations and suggestions regarding the operation of the Honor System. Various questions were raised by Faculty members and discussed. Especially important was the reminder that Faculty members are obligated to cooperate with the Honor System, as stated in "Information for Members of the Faculty," revised version dated 6/20/1953, page 8.

Minute 6: The Faculty expressed interest in the suggestion advanced by the Students' Council that publication of outstanding student work might be feasible and desirable, and endorsed informal participation by the Faculty in exploring the possibilities in this regard.

The special meeting with the students' representatives closed at 5:50 P.M.

Minute 7: The foregoing Minutes were approved by the Faculty.

Adjourned 5:55 P.M.

Gerhard Friedrich
Secretary
Faculty Minute in Memory of Lester C. Haworth

On August 15, 1954, Lester C. Haworth, Vice-President of Haverford College, died suddenly at his summer home in Eastham, Massachusetts. As news of his death reached the campus, expressions of sympathy with his family were accompanied by a keen sense of the loss which not only his relatives and friends, but also Haverford College had suffered. At its first meeting of the new college year, on September 20, 1954, the Faculty decided to make its appreciation of Lester Haworth's devoted service to Haverford College a matter of permanent record.

When Lester Haworth came to Haverford College in 1948 as Vice-President in charge of public relations and development, he had behind him already an amazingly active and effective career dedicated to educational and religious causes, which had taken him from his alma mater, Earlham College, to various parts of this country as well as to India and other areas in the Orient. He had also become prominently identified with national and international concerns of the Society of Friends. This rich background of associations and experience, combined with clear-sighted common sense, the habit of carefully planned and hard work, an infectious sincerity of devotion, and a warm human touch, enabled him to accomplish within the span of only a few years great things toward the realization of what he liked to call "the campus of the future."

Two phases of Lester Haworth's unwearied work for the improvement of Haverford College demand special attention here. Immediately after joining Haverford College, he was primarily responsible for mapping and inspiring a campaign to raise the sum of $1,250,000 to purchase books for the College Library, increase scholarships, and raise faculty salaries. When that large-scale effort was successfully concluded, he took the initiative in launching the current $1,000,000 Development Program, with its complementary emphasis on new buildings and modernization of the present plant, which now, toward the end of its second year, has passed the two-thirds mark. In connection with these major efforts, Lester Haworth proved himself an able interpreter of the College and its aims and needs to many new friends as well as to the alumni. He believed in its purpose as a liberal arts college, and whatever he did to further this purpose was characterized by persistency, solidity, and tact. Always friendly and apparently relaxed, he was a man of great energy directed toward worthy goals of his own choosing. Not the least of his accomplishments was that, despite a recurrent heart ailment, he retained his confident cheerfulness and a fine sense of humor.

The removal of Lester Haworth from the Haverford scene leaves in several respects a sorely felt gap.
I have checked into the recorded practice of the Faculty with regard to the death of one of its members or of a board member, and have found the following.

During the last five and a half years, since the beginning of school year 1948-49, the Faculty Minutes have made reference to the death of four Faculty members and one member of the Board of Managers, namely:

- Gilbert Hoag (February 21, 1952);
- Arlington Evans (September 22, 1952);
- Howard Henry (September 21, 1953);
- Herbert Taylor (September 21, 1953);
- Morris Leeds (February 21, 1952).

In each of these cases, the Faculty expressed its sorrow and directed the Secretary to convey its condolences to the surviving families. In each case the Minute was brief, the letter about half a page to a page long, and no special "memorial minute" was drawn up.

I have not pursued the matter beyond the beginning of the 1948-49 college year, except to check into the case of Rufus Jones, who died on June 16, 1948. Surprisingly enough, there is no reference whatever among the Faculty Minutes to Rufus Jones's death. The Minutes of the next meeting, held on September 20, 1948, record approval of the Minutes of the June 9 meeting and deal with other ordinary matters. (The September 20, 1948 Minutes are unsigned.) I suppose the failure to mention the death of Rufus Jones can be explained in two logical ways: 1. like the four Faculty deaths mentioned above, it occurred during the summer vacation; and 2. it may have been felt that in a real sense Rufus Jones has never passed from the Haverford scene. Which incidentally may lead us to a reasonably restrained solution to the "memorial minute" question.

The IN MEMORIAM booklet on Rufus Jones, published - I believe - in 1950, is another matter, but again the Faculty as a body is not represented in it with a special minute.
Minute 1: In the course of the regular order of business, Ted Hetzel reported that, for financial reasons, the Graduate Program in Social and Technical Assistance will in several ways have to be curtailed for the year 1955-1956. The faculty had previously approved continuation of the STA program in its present form to June 1956, pending the report of a special committee appointed by the President to study the entire problem of graduate work at Haverford College (see Minute 5 of the Faculty Minutes of June 2, 1954, and Annex 1, Recommendations 1 and 2, and also Minute 3 of the Faculty Minutes of December 14, 1953). The Committee on the Graduate Curriculum in Social and Technical Assistance was asked to reconsider and clarify its position with regard to the proposed changes and to submit specific recommendations for faculty action at the next faculty meeting.

Adjourned 12 noon.

Gerhard Friedrich

Secretary
Regular meeting  
Vice-President MacIntosh presiding  
November 1, 1954  
4:10 P.M.

Minute 1: The Curriculum Committee recommended and the faculty approved the offering of a reading course in American history (History 41-42) for the current college year.

Minute 2: The faculty accepted the report of the Committee on the Graduate Curriculum in Social and Technical Assistance (see Annex 1), and agreed to the proposed changes necessitated in the STA program for 1955-56.

Minute 3: The Minute of the meeting of October 21, 1954, was approved as read.

Minute 4: The foregoing Minutes were read and approved.

Adjourned 4:30 P.M.

Gerhard Friedrich
Secretary
REPORT TO THE FACULTY BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE GRADUATE CURRICULUM

In response to the request of the faculty, expressed at its meeting on 21 October 1954, the Committee on the Graduate Curriculum in Social and Technical Assistance reports as follows on its plans for the academic year 1955-56.

A sample schedule of academic courses is as follows:

**FIRST SEMESTER**
- Soc Sci 91 Case Study of Assist. Program, etc.
- Soc Sci 98 Research Project & Thesis
- Sociology 61 Social Research
- Ec/Pol Sci 53 International Relations
- Edu Internat Welfare & Social Assist. (or: Psych 81 Special Topics, etc.)

**SECOND SEMESTER**
- Soc Sci 94 Orientation, etc.
- Soc Sci 99 Research Project & Thesis
- Pol Sci 64 Poli., & Social Theory
- Ec/Pol Sci 54 International Relations
- Edu Internat Welfare & Social Assist. (or: Psych 81 Special Topics, etc.)

Comprehensive Examination

Research projects for theses may be case studies of projects of voluntary agencies and others operating assistance and developmental programs.

The supervision of the students' work will continue to be the responsibility of the Committee on the Graduate Curriculum. The above curriculum and this arrangement of oversight is an improvement over the traditional practices of the College with regard to T. Wistar. From graduate students in simplification of administration, uniformity of standards.

Regular offerings in the Non-Academic Program will be open to the graduate students, with particular emphasis on the activities of Community Service and Weekend Workcamps. The mid-winter field project will not be offered.

All students admitted to this program will be required to have some preparation in the social sciences and to have a common interest in the field of social and technical assistance. It is to be expected that there will be fewer students admitted than in the past.

No decision has yet been made with regard to housing arrangements, but it may be necessary to discontinue the cooperative housekeeping set-up.

The program outlined above is believed to be a valid program for the interval during which all aspects of the Graduate Curriculum are being studied. It keeps us active in this general area, and therefore more easily able to set up a new but related program, if that is determined to be desirable.

Suggestions of other ideas and comments upon these proposals will be welcomed by this committee and will be of help to the special committee which is to make recommendations for the Graduate Curriculum of the future.
Regular meeting  
President White presiding  

December 6, 1954  
4:10 P.M.

Minute 1: The Special Committee on Campus Security Checks by Federal Agencies submitted a comprehensive report in two parts (see Annexes 1 and 2), including three specific recommendations embodied in Part II, Section D, paragraphs 1 and 2. Major objections to the apparent emphasis of the report were voiced by Herman Somers, who pointed out that, according to the limiting provisions as stated in Part II, Section D, paragraph 3, the vast majority of security-check inquiries about students and faculty members would in fact fall into that category where the claimed privileged relationship would be deemed abrogated, and thus the basic professional justification for a privileged position with regard to security checks by Federal agencies is largely surrendered or put in doubt. Ted Benfey and Holland Hunter likewise argued in favor of a clearcut general policy that no isolated and unevaluated data should be transmitted to investigating agencies. The faculty then accepted the committee's report with the proviso that it be considered as unfinished business in need of further clarification, with the hope that a decision regarding the principle and the policy to be adopted in this matter might be reached at an early meeting of the faculty. Toward the end of the discussion, the weight of opinion seemed strongly to favor the unequivocal position advocated by Messrs. Somers, Benfey, and Hunter. The secretary was asked to see to it that a revised recommendation be formulated for action at the February meeting.

Adjourned 5:55 P.M.

Gerhard Friedrich  
Secretary
REPORT OF THE TEMPORARY COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS
Security Checks by Federal Agencies

November 30, 1954.

INTRODUCTION

1. The Temporary Committee on Campus Security Checks by Federal Agencies was appointed pursuant to the faculty motion of February 19, 1954, to report on "the kind and the possible consequences of information regarding individual students at Haverford, in particular their views as expressed within the framework of the educational process, which Government agencies have on several occasions sought from faculty members."

2. The Committee extended the scope of its inquiry to include security checks made on former students, faculty, and administration. "Government agencies" was interpreted as agencies of the executive branch of the federal government, which is most likely to be the Federal Bureau of Investigation, but may be Military Intelligence or a representative of the security division of a department or agency. The committee specifically excluded from its deliberations questions about testimony before state or federal congressional committees, although parts of this report may be germane in the latter case.

3. This report is divided into two parts. Part One is informational. With the original suggestion to the faculty concerning this problem was the thought that the faculty should be informed on a program which concerns all of us. Part Two contains specific recommendations made to the faculty by the Committee.
This section of the report is derived largely from Chapter 5 of Barth, A., *The Loyalty of Free Men* & Chapter 12 of Wyl, N., *The Battle Against Disloyalty*.

Prior to 1939, the federal government was protected from treason, espionage, subversion, and the like on the part of its employees solely by one positive measure: an oath to support and defend the constitution of the United States. The Civil Service Act of 1884 had specifically banned any test of political orthodoxy on the part of employees coming under that Act.

The Hatch Act of 1939 forbade any federal employee to hold "membership in any political party or organization which advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government", a throwback to the 1920 immigration act which made such membership a deportable offense for aliens. In 1940 the Alien Registration Act forbade all Americans "to teach or advocate the duty or necessity of overthrowing by force or violence a government created by just such advocacy." This type of restriction was brought home to governmental departments and agencies by the prohibition of any appropriation for salaries of people who advocate the overthrow, etc. in a rider to appropriation bills in 1941.

The concept of disloyalty in the federal service embodied in the Hatch Act, extended in 1940, when the Secretary of the Army and of the Navy were given power to remove summarily, without regard to other laws, anyone who in their opinion constituted a risk to the security of the country. Later the Secretary of State and the Atomic Energy Commission were to be given the same powers. This general type of provision was extended on a temporary basis in 1942, when President Roosevelt issued war service regulations specifying that one of the grounds on which an employee could be barred from the Civil Service was the existence of a reasonable doubt as to his loyalty. It was in this year that an Interdepartmental Committee on Investigations was formed by the Attorney General to attempt standardization of procedures among different departments and agencies, but in practice funds were not available for any sort of thorough investigation by the Civil Service Committee.

This was the way the situation stood to the end of the war. In 1945 the investigations of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and other developments led President Truman to create a President's Temporary Commission on Employee Loyalty, which submitted recommendations that led to the Truman Executive Order No. 9835, March 21, 1947, "prescribing procedures for the administration of an employees' loyalty program in the Executive Branch of the Government."
Executive Order No. 9835 established the following: "The Standard for the refusal of employment or the removal from employment in an executive department or agency on grounds relating to loyalty shall be that, on all the evidence, reasonable grounds exist for belief that the person involved is disloyal to the Government of the United States. Every employee and applicant had to file his fingerprints and answer under oath a detailed personnel security questionnaire (PSQ). A name check was then to be run against existing files of the FBI and others (including the House Un-American Activities Committee), which was to be followed by a full field check if any derogatory information was uncovered.

For each department or agency there was established a loyalty review board to pass on loyalty cases, while new applicants were processed through Regional Loyalty Boards of the Civil Service Commission. In the case of an adverse recommendation from one of these boards, the affected employee could appeal first to the head of the agency or his designee, and then finally, to the Loyalty Review Board of the Civil Service Commission, which was headed by Seth W. Richardson. The Loyalty Review Board was not only supreme arbiter but also guiding light and provider of standards for the whole program.

Grounds for disloyalty included a number of considerations which in fact were grounds for expulsion under one or another regulation or act prior to Order No. 9835:

1. Actual or attempted sabotage, espionage, treason, or sedition;
2. Advocacy of revolution or force to change the constitutional form of government of the United States;
3. Intentional or unauthorized disclosure of confidential documents or information obtained as a result of public employment; and
4. Performance of duty "so as to serve the interests of another government in preference to the interests of the United States."

What was new in the Truman order was the following ground for dismissal obtained in a sub-paragraph:

"f. Membership in, affiliation with or sympathetic association with any foreign or domestic organization, association, movement, group or combination of persons designated by the Attorney General as totalitarian, fascist, communist, or subversive, or as having adopted a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence to deny other persons their rights under the Constitution of the United States or as seeking to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means." This led to the formation of the Attorney General's Black List. It may be said here that "membership" is a clearly ascertainable fact. "Affiliation with has been defined by the Supreme Court to mean a relationship which indicates an adherence to or furtherance of the purposes or objectives of the proscribed organization as distinguished from mere cooperation with it in lawful activities."

---

3/ Ibid, p. 133. (Underlining ours.)
4/ loc. cit.
"Sympathetic association" may mean almost anything, including, as various Loyalty Review Board interpretations brought out, even being on an organization's mailing list. Further, the list of organizations which arose in Board hearings was greatly extended beyond the Attorney General's list, especially certain organizations such as the United Public Workers of America and the Southern Conference on Human Welfare, both of which are on the list of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.  

There were amendments of one sort or another to Executive Order No. 9835 between 1947 and early 1953, but in general the Order governed disloyalty on part of federal employees during this period. It covered all federal employees. For certain "sensitive" agencies and departments, however, the loyalty status of an employee was insufficient for the needs of internal security. For the Armed Services, the State Department (in the McCarran Act to its appropriations bill, July 5, 1946), the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Central Intelligence Agency, the loyalty program was supplemented by an extended security-risk program, similar to that which had been applied to just the Army and Navy during the war. For sensitive departments and agencies it was thought necessary to eliminate unintentionally as well as intentionally dangerous employees, and for this the head of a department or agency was empowered to reject applicants and dismiss employees summarily, without the procedural protections of the loyalty program. Grounds for dismissal varied among departments and agencies. This is where the matter stood until August 26, 1950.

_Public Law 733, August 26, 1950._

To many the prevention of security-risks from sensitive positions and the disloyal from all federal employment was not an adequate safeguard for national security. Richard Nixon urged on January 30, 1950, for example, that the loyalty program be blanketed with the program for security-risks under one general heading for all federal employees:

"It is necessary that we completely overhaul our system of checking the loyalty of federal employees. Mr. Hiss would have passed the present loyalty tests with flying colors. The loyalty checks are based primarily on open affiliations with Communist-front organizations. Underground Communists and espionage agents have no open affiliations and it is therefore almost impossible to apprehend them through a routine loyalty investigation under the President's order. Serious consideration should be given to changing the entire approach under the loyalty order and placing the program on a security risk basis. In this way, where there is any doubt about an individual who has access to confidential information, that doubt can be resolved in favor of the government without the necessity of proving disloyalty and thereby reflecting on the character of a possibly loyal but indiscreet government employee."

1/ For a detailed description of some cases brought before the Loyalty Review Board, see items in attached bibliography, especially Barth.

2/ Quoted in Barth, _op. cit.,_ p. 136
Richard Nixon did not get his full program instituted until he took office as vice-president of the United States in early 1953. There was a partial step in this direction, however, in a seldom referred to act signed by President Truman on August 26, 1950 (Public Law 733), which provided that ten agencies, covering most federal employees, could suspend men at their "absolute discretion and when deemed necessary in the interest of national security." 1/

The Eisenhower Executive Order No. 10450

On April 27, 1953, the full Nixon program was instituted under Executive Order No. 10450. Since this order supplanted the Truman Order and Public Law 733 and now governs all security checks on federal employees and applicants for federal employment, it is worth while summarizing its main portions in some detail. 2/ "Whereas the interests of the national security require that all persons privileged to be employed in the departments and agencies of the Government shall be reliable, trustworthy, of good conduct and character, and of complete and unswerving loyalty to the United States; and whereas the American tradition that all persons should receive fair, impartial, and equitable treatment at the hands of the Government requires that all persons seeking the privilege of employment or privileged to be employed in the departments and agencies of the Government be adjudged by mutually consistent and no less than minimum standards and procedures among the departments and agencies governing the employment and retention in employment in the Federal service....the Act of August 26, 1950, 64 Stat. 476...

1. is extended to all departments and agencies of the Government.

Further:

2. It is the responsibility of the head of each department or agency to see that retention of all employees is "clearly consistent with the interests of the national security."

3A. The appointment of each civilian employee is subject to investigation, which shall "in no event include less than a national agency check (including a check on fingerprint files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation) and written inquiries to appropriate local law enforcement agencies, former employers and supervisors, references, and schools attended by the person under investigation." If there is any adverse information uncovered, a full field check is required.

3B. The head of each department or agency is to designate sensitive positions, necessitating automatically a full field investigation.

4, 5, and 6. The head of each department is to review, or cause to be reviewed, all cases on which a full field investigation is made. He is given complete power over such employment on the basis of whether or not employment is "clearly consistent with the interests of the national security."

1/ Weyl, on cit. p. 195.

2/ The executive Order is printed in its entirety in the New York Times, April 26, 1953, p. 20. (Any underlining is ours.)
8A. The investigations conducted pursuant to this order shall be designed to develop information as to whether the employment or retention in employment in the Federal service of a person being investigated is clearly consistent with the interests of national security. Such information shall relate, but shall not be limited, to the following:

1. Depending on the relation of the Government employment to the national security:

I. Any behavior, activities, or associations which tend to show that the individual is not reliable or trustworthy;

II. Any deliberate misrepresentations, falsifications, or omission of material facts;

III. Any criminal, infamous, dishonest, immoral, or notoriously disgraceful conduct, habitual use of intoxicants to excess, drug addiction, or sexual perversion;

IV. An adjudication of insanity, or treatment for serious mental or neurological disorder without satisfactory evidence of cure;

V. Any facts which furnish reason to believe that the individual may be subjected to coercion, influence, or pressure which may cause him to act contrary to the best interests of the national security.

2. Commission of any act of sabotage, espionage, treason...

3. Establishing or continuing a sympathetic association with a saboteur, spy, traitor...

4. Advocacy of use of force or violence to overthrow the Government of the United States, or of the alteration of the form of Government of the United States by unconstitutional means;

5. Membership in, or affiliation or sympathetic association with, any foreign or domestic organization, association, movement, (etc.) which is totalitarian, Fascist, Communist or subversive...

6. Intentional, unauthorized disclosure of confidential information...

7. Performing or attempting to perform his duties so as to serve the interests of another Government in preference to the United States.

9A, B, C. There shall be established a Security-Investigations Index within the Civil Service Commission (a central locator), but the Federal Bureau of Investigation or other agencies are to keep actual security files except when needed by particular departments or agencies.

11. The Loyalty Review Board is to be terminated.
Security Checks on Other than Actual or Prospective Employees of the Federal Government

There are two types of security checks other than those on actual or prospective employees which may concern us here at Haverford: Federal Bureau of Investigation checks on conscientious objectors, and general checks which may be made by the FBI on private citizens who are not in any way employed by the Federal Government.

Checks made on conscientious objectors are authorized by the Selective Service Act and are optional at the request of a local draft board. While information elicited will normally be more concerned with the religious philosophy of the person in question and how he arrived at his position as conscientious objector, experience has shown that the check is not very dissimilar to checks on federal employees.

Authorization for checks on private citizens who are neither in the employ of or seeking employment with the Federal Government nor are conscientious objectors is a moot point. The Federal Bureau of Investigation will not state whether or not such checks are ever made, on the grounds that this is confidential information. There is abundant evidence to indicate, however, that the Bureau does in fact seek information for its files on some persons who are not in any way connected with federal employment nor taking a position as conscientious objectors.

The Nature of Security Checks

It is impossible to generalize about security checks. Faculty experience has varied widely, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation cannot give out any information about the nature of the questioning (whether or not there is an established pattern of questions, at least initially, and so forth) on the grounds that such information is confidential. It may well be that more information about security checks would be given us if we arranged for a conference with Norman McCabe, chief of the local branch of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (see recommendations below).

Questioning of the faculty has varied from a rather standard line relating to membership in subversive organizations, excessive drinking, and any reason to believe that the person in question was not reliable or trustworthy to questions on what the person read and whether or not he had ever expressed any "radical ideas" in class or elsewhere. In the case of conscientious objectors, questions have ranged from the honesty of a person's belief in a supreme being to whether or not he ever got into trouble with girls. In general, security checks seem to vary with

a) the objective of the check, i.e. for what position the person being checked is being investigated, if any, and b) the particular investigator.

Information obtained through field checks is supposedly both given in confidence and kept in confidence. Sometimes the investigator will ask, either at the beginning or end of an interview, that the information given and even the fact that the check was made be kept from the person being subjected to the check. Sometimes no such request will be made. The question of whether or not the information obtained is kept confidential has been much in the news in recent periods; there is no doubt that information has been leaked to congressional committees, has been used in political campaigns, and has otherwise been made available to unauthorized persons. The release of such confidential information perhaps is not
so much an issue, however, as the question of whether or not there should be such confidential restrictions in the first place — especially when such information is kept from the person who is being investigated.

APPENDIX TO PART ONE

Selected Bibliography Concerned With The Problem of Government Security Investigations

Books

JC 328. B28. 186632

UB270. H31. 181915.

Weyl, N., The Battle Against Disloyalty (New York: Crowell, 1951.)
A popular history of disloyalty cases in America with chapters on the FBI, the Amarantha case, Owen Lattimore, etc. 
E743.5, W54, 183794.

LB 2332. S95. 194695.
Articles


Lewis, A., "Our Security Program Need Not Be Unfair," Reporter, November 1, 1954, pp. 19-24. Very good summary of criticisms of the program and concrete suggestions as to how the system should be improved.
PART TWO. THE POSITION OF THE COLLEGE

A. What is the nature of our concern about security checks on students and faculty?

1. The basic assumption of the security program of the Federal Government which has been outlined in Part One is that the Government has a right to, and indeed must, protect itself from disloyalty and subversion. The Committee feels that this assumption is certainly justified. The problem of ascertaining the loyalty and possible future acts of subversion on the part of any individual is, however, fraught with danger, and the Committee feels considerable concern about what we conceive to be a possible threat to the spirit of free inquiry here at the college which may stem from the existing governmental security program.

Chief Justice Holmes once argued that what we must retain in this country is "the free trade of ideas — that the test of truth is the power of thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market." Normally only a small part of a security investigation is related directly to an individual's beliefs or opinions; the bulk of the questions asked concern a person's character, integrity, overt actions such as memberships in organizations, and the like, which may be answered without impinging upon "the free trade of ideas." The small part of the investigation which may relate to opinions and ideas is, however, vitally important. The primary concern of the Committee is that students and faculty members seek to avoid controversial, unpopular positions or these may be used against them in the future. While there may be many facets to the whole complex problem of our internal security program and its effects on the mental and spiritual health of the country in general and this community in particular, it is this fear of possible limitations on the free traffic in ideas which has motivated our study of the problem.

B. Are there grounds for treating the college campus in some special manner with respect to the providing of security information on students and faculty?

1. The Committee finds the answer to this question to be "yes." This is not because the objective of the pursuit of truth should be some special preserve for the college campus, to be distinguished in this respect from the home, the factory, the office, or the high school. Nor is it because teachers and students are some special sort of animal for whom the freedom to search for truth should be considered more sacrosanct than the freedom accorded carpenters, housewives, or business executives. Rather, the special nature of the college campus derives from two sources: the means of searching for truth at college are generally more complex and varied than is true for other walks of life. Secondly, the obligation to promote free inquiry in the search for truth bears more heavily upon teachers and students in their daily work than is the case for others.

2. The years of undergraduate education are formative years for young men and women -- years when they are, and should be, trying out new ideas. They are years when students may be finding their systems of values, so neatly ordered and arranged perhaps when they entered college, disrupted. Value-making, which must be the central feature of a liberal arts education, may be, as Robert Redfield suggests, value-shaking. During such a period, when there is a daily obligation to follow the search for truth but the means of such a search may be new, varied, and highly complex, students may well do and say things they later disclaim. Mistakes, however, are a fundamental part of education. Further, because of complexity of material both students and teachers are especially vulnerable to misunderstanding and misrepresentation, but these too are probably necessary, if unfortunate, aspects of the search for truth.

C. Is the special nature of the college recognized in legislative acts or executive orders which authorize security checks?

No, not explicitly; that is to say, nowhere is there any statement which distinguishes in any way between information received on a person while at college and information received at other stages in his or her career. It is entirely up to the person making the evaluation as to how he wishes to weight information received.

D. What should Haverford do?

1. First, the Committee feels that Haverford cannot assume any unique position on these matters by itself without undue hardship to many students and faculty members. If, for example, in an extreme case, the faculty passed a resolution urging all faculty members not to give any information to the FBI or others making security checks, those students desiring positions in Government would be hurt. The Committee, therefore, believes that the general problem is one which should be studied on an intercollegiate basis and expresses the hope that faculty members interested in the American Association of University Professors, the American Association of Colleges, or other intercollegiate groups may originate some action within these organizations. 

2. Secondly, the Committee recommends that Haverford take certain moderate steps of its own which may be beneficial in easing what seems to us to be a threat to the spirit of free inquiry here from the system of security checks. These steps are to:

(a) establish the general rule that

professional activity among students and faculty at Haverford on a privileged basis, which in any individual case, with the exception noted under paragraph 1 below,

(b) reach an understanding with local security authorities in collaboration with other institutions as to the character of the investigations and the nature of questions and responses deemed proper in a security interview.

No such official intercollegiate organization has taken any step in this direction so far as we have been able to ascertain. The AAUP
3. By "putting professional activity on a privileged basis," we mean
that all discussion carried on as part of normal professional campus
activity or knowledge of what a person reads, obtained in or out of
class, and the like, shall be 'off the record.' This will not prevent
anyone from giving a general judgment of a person's character, integrity,
even if it prevent him from citing specific statements, or other
pieces of direct evidence obtained in a professional capacity. Such
a privileged relationship should be deemed abrogated if a person seeks
or takes a position which, by law or executive order, subjects him to a
security check. Further, the privileged relationship should be limited
to security checks, the subject of this inquiry, and should not extend to
references for employers, graduate schools, and the like. Statements
in this latter connection should be left to the judgment of individual
faculty members.

4. With respect to the second step -- reaching an understanding with local
security authorities -- we suggest that this be left in the hands of the
President, or whomever he appoint, but that one fruitful approach
might be to invite the local director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation
and representatives of other federal security agencies to a dinner-conference
from which representatives of neighboring institutions might be
asked to join in a discussion of the problem.

Respectfully submitted:

Howard Comfort
Edward Snyder
Philip Bell.

1/ (cont. from previous page) has adopted a number of declarations on
congressional investigations; for example, in 1952 and again in 1953
there was a declaration "against the tendency, in legislative investi-
gations relating to loyalty, toward using the professional writings
and utterances, and the lawful personal associations of individuals,
to impugn their loyalty without regard to context of time or circum-
stances." See Summers, R.R. (ed), Freedom and Loyalty in our Colleges,
pp. 64-5. The American Association of Universities passed the follow-
ing resolution in 1952:

"Every scholar has an obligation to maintain this reputation of
capability and integrity..."

"As in all acts of association, the professor accepts conventions
which become morally binding. Above all, he owes his colleagues
in the university complete candor and perfect integrity, preclud-
ing any kind of clandestine or conspiratorial activities. He owes
equal candor to the public. If he is called upon to answer for his
convictions, it is his duty as a citizen to speak out. It is even
more definitely his duty as a professor. Refusal to do so, on what-
ever legal grounds, cannot fail to speak and the maximum protection
of that freedom available in our society." See Summers, op.cit.,
pp. 128-130. But nowhere has the issue of confidential testimony
to security investigators been raised.

reflect upon a profession that claims for itself the fullest freedom to-
Special meeting
President White presiding
January 17, 1955
4:10 P.M.

Minute 1: This special faculty meeting had been called to provide opportunity for an informal discussion of the senior seminar program, Haverford 100, at a strategic point halfway through its experimental period. A detailed report (see Annex 1) had been previously distributed, and was supplemented orally by Frank Parker, Ted Benney, Arnold Post, and Herman Somers, all of whom emphasized the beneficial broadening effect to themselves, as well as to the students, which has resulted from the experience of cooperating with representatives of other departments in such an inter-disciplinary undertaking. A vigorous discussion of various aspects and implications of the present tripartite setup of the experiment followed.

Adjourned 5:50 P.M.

Gerhard Friedrich
Secretary
The first half of a three year Rockefeller Foundation financed experiment with a senior seminar at Haverford College is now being completed. The January 17 special faculty meeting has been called in order that the staff may exchange information and ideas on this subject with interested faculty members. Although it is not the purpose of this meeting to reach any decisions, the staff will greatly appreciate suggestions from the faculty. It is hoped that faculty members will have an opportunity to peruse the following facts prior to the faculty meeting.

The faculty staff for the first two semesters of the program consisted of Ted Benfey, Frank Parker, Arnold Post, and John Roche; during the third semester John Roche was replaced by Red Somers. President White and other members of the faculty have advised and collaborated with the staff. In accordance with the original proposal to the Rockefeller Foundation, the first semester of last year was devoted primarily to planning the pilot seminar offered in the second semester. Weekly meetings about two and a half hours in length were held throughout the first semester to discuss the aims and methods of a senior seminar in general and to plan the second semester pilot seminar in particular. Other faculty members and off-campus visitors were consulted at these meetings. Study was also given to similar programs at Brandeis University, Reed College, Union College, the University of Chicago, and the University of Washington.

The aim of this three year experiment with a senior seminar, as proposed to the Rockefeller Foundation, is to investigate the possibility, advisability, and techniques of providing for college seniors a common intellectual experience designed to help each student gain, and to retain through his future years, a greater degree of unified perspective of his life in the world.

In their junior and senior years, especially with the growing popularity of project courses, students tend to specialize more and more and now have no curricular way of seeing their own specialties from an over-archng perspective. The result is that any pre-specialized view of life, experience, and knowledge which they may have gained in their lower class years tends to vanish under the pressure of upper class specialization. The primary purpose of the senior seminar experiment is to examine the possibility and desirability of supplementing this situation. A concomitant aim, however, is the broadening of the faculty members involved, and, through them, the regular course work of the college.

Listed below are descriptions of the techniques used last spring and this fall in order to try to realize the above aims. Further experiments will be conducted in the second semester of this year.

**SPRING 1955**

1. Population:
   1. Twelve students, four from each of the three divisions, representing the departments of mathematics and physics (1), chemistry (3), political science (2), sociology (2), English (2), German (1), and history (1).
2. Four regular faculty members (Benfey, Parker, Post, and Roche), plus some one visiting faculty member at most of the sessions, plus occasional off-campus visitors.

II. Meetings
1. One two and a half hour seminar each week, the chairmanship rotating among the four regular faculty members.
2. Classroom methods varied. Sometimes students papers were read and discussed; at other times there were reports on diversified reading; and once students and faculty read and discussed their favorite poems.

III. Reading: For most sessions students were assigned both common and diversified reading. The common readings are here listed with the weekly topics; the diversified readings are listed separately below.

IV. Writing: A one or two page paper every other week.

V. Course Structure: The general topic: To What Extent Can Man Control His Own Destiny?
1. Organization meeting
2. To what extent can man control his own destiny? George Stewart, Earth Abides.
8. What are the sources of individual and group conflict? Paton, Cry the Beloved Country.
10. How far is human life fortified and enriched by imaginative detachment, for instance by contemplation of tragedy? Shaw, Saint Joan.
12. How far is poetry a controlling force in the lives of men? Various poems were read in and out of class.
13. What are the criteria of success? Some one work about a successful or famous person (see attached list of diversified readings).
14. How do I find out what I ought to do, or want to do, or have to do? Each student read one of the following four: Fromm, Man For Himself: Lumberger, Can Science Save Us?; Tillich, The Courage to Be; and both Kelly, Testament of Devotion and Fenelon, Spiritual Letters.
Diversified readings: For some weeks some one of these was required for each student; for other weeks they were only suggested. (The numbers match the session numbers in the Course Structure.)

2. Huxley, Brave New World; Orwell, 1984; Camus, The Plague; Serge, The Case of Comrade Tulayev.


4. P. Wiener, Readings in Philosophy of Science; Feigl and Brodbeck, Readings in Philosophy of Science; Frank, Modern Science and Its Philosophy, Eddington, Nature of the Physical World, Science and the Unseen World, and Philosophy of Physical Science; Burt, Metaphysical Foundations of Modern Physical Science; Werkmeister, A Philosophy of Science, and the Basis and Structure of Knowledge; Bridgman, The Logic of Modern Physics, and Reflections of a Physicist; Poincaré, Science and Hypothesis, and Science and Method; Born, Natural Philosophy of Cause and Chance; Sullivan, The Limitations of Science; Russell, Our Knowledge of the External World; Dingle, The Scientific Adventure; Smith, Philosophical Physics; von Mises, Positivism; and Margenau, "The New Faith of Science."

5. Mumford, Techniques and Civilization; Gouwsmit, Alsos; Wigner, Physical Science and Human Values; Ansen, Social Service; Huxley, Heredity East and West; Zirkle, Death of a Science in Russia; Barber, Science and the Social Order; N. Wiener, The Human Use of Human Beings; Crowther, The Social Relations of Science; Nef, War and Human Progress; Gellhorn, Security, Loyalty, and Science; and Baker, Science and the Planned State.

6. Chambers, Wines; Barmine, One Who Survived; dos Passos, Adventures of a Young Man; Einaudi, Communism in Western Europe; Fromm, Escape from Freedom; Hoffer, The True Believer; Hyde, I Believed; Aestler, Arrival and Departure; Malraux, Man's Fate; Monnerot, The Sociology of Communism; Payne, Mao Tse Tung; Riesman, The Lonely Crowd; Vailes, Red Dust.

7. Milton, The Eve of Conflict; Craven, The Coming of the Civil War; Randall, Civil War and Reconstruction, and two articles; Cole, The Irrepressible Conflict; Marx, The Civil War in the United States; Boucher, "In re: That Aggressive Slavocracy", MEHR. VIII; and Nichols, The Disruption of American Democracy.

8. Adorno, The Authoritarian Personality; Bettelheim and Janowitz, Dynamics of Prejudice; Ackerman and Jahoda, Anti-Semitism and Emotional Disorder; Masing, Rehearsal for Destruction; Lowenthal and Guterman, Prophets of Deceit; Cantril, Psychology of Social Movements; Drucker, The End of Economic Man; Myrdal, An American Dilemma; Law, Resolving Social Conflicts; Cox, Class, and Race; Janowitz, "The Black Legion" in America in Crisis; O'Neill, The Emperor Jones; Van Woodward, Tom Watson; Sartre, Jew and Anti-Semite; Rukavina, Jungle Pathfinder; Bridges, The Uttermost Part of the Earth; Clifford, The Prince of Malaya; Lanham, Blanket Boy; Twain Yang, Houseboy in India; Hozari, Indian Outcast; Nakerji, Caste and Outcast; Clifford, The Further Side of Silence; Kang, The Grass Roof, and East Goes West; Takuzawa Yukichi, Autobiography; Sugimoto, A Daughter of the Samurai; Howatt, People of the Deer.

9. Eddington, Science and the Unseen World; Fromm, Psychoanalysis and Religion; and Maritain, the preface to The Degrees of Knowledge.
10. Shakespeare, Hamlet, Macbeth, Othello, King Lear, Julius Caesar, and Romeo and Juliet; T'sao, The Dream of the Red Chamber; Sophocles, Antigone, and Oedipus Rex; Euripides, Trojan Women, and Bacchae; Hemingway, For Whom The Bell Tolls; Ibsen, Hedda Gabler; Montague, Rough Justice; Wharton, Ethan Frome; DeMorgan, Alice for Short; Conrad, Lord Jim; Remarque, All Quiet on the Western Front.

13. Lamb, Genghis Khan, and Alexander of Macedon; George Fox, Journal, Shub, Lenin; Chaplin, Wobbly; Young, Stanley Baldwin; Chesterton or Sabattier, St. Francis of Assisi; Dostoevsky, The Idiot; Barton, The Man Nobody Knows; Buttinger, In The Twilight of Socialism; Miller, Jonathan Edwards; Spring, Fame is the Spur; Strachey, Eminent Victorians; Sullivan, Beethoven; Eve Curie, Madame Curie; Wilson, The Essential Shakespeare; Harsanyi, The Star Gazer; Frank, Einstein: His Life and Times; Schilpp, Albert Einstein; Vallery-Radot, The Life of Pasteur; Taylor, Socrates.

14. Plato, Republic; Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics; Epictetus, Discourses, and Manual; The Synoptic Gospels; Spinoza, Ethics; Kant, Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysics of Morals; Thos. a Kempis, The Imitation of Christ; Mill, Utilitarianism; Duber, I and Thou; Pascal, Thoughts; Kierkegaard, Either-Or; Camus, The Rebel; Niebuhr, Interpretation of Christian Ethics; Dostoevsky, The Grand Inquisitor in Brothers Karamazov; C.S. Lewis, The Abolition of Man, Screwtape Letters, and Christian Behavior; and Dewey, A Common Faith.

FALL, 1954-55

For the first semester of 1954-55 it was decided to broaden the experiment by having three sections: (A) a seminar group of a type similar to the one in the spring but this time with only two faculty members present (Frank Parker and Red Somers, who took John Roche's place); (B) a tutorial section with Ted Benfey; and (C) a smaller seminar with Arnold Post. The descriptions of these sections are as follows:

A. THE LARGER SEMINAR: (H.M. Somers and F.H. Parker)

Six students, two from each of three divisions, representing the departments of chemistry (2), sociology (2) and English (2), met each week for a two-hour seminar. Papers of about 1500 words were required from each student every third week, so that there were two papers each week. The two hours of the seminar were devoted to a discussion of these two papers, the student author being the discussion leader and using his paper as a background for the discussion. A term paper was also required. All assigned readings were common, though additional readings were sometimes suggested, and students were expected to do further research on their own for their term papers. In addition to the regular faculty, three guests were present and participated, Nigel Nicolson at session 3, Sir Zafrulla Khan at session 8, and Field Haviland at session 9.

General Topic: "Alternatives to the H-Bomb"

3. The revolution in science and the place of science in the crisis. Gamow, Mr. Tompkins Explores the Atom; Oppenheimer, Science and the Common Understanding (selections); and Margenau, "The New Faith of Science".


6. The effect of the crisis on civil liberties. A. Miller, "The Crucible" (also seen by some of the students); Commager, Freedom, Loyalty, and Dissent; Somers, "Military Policy and Democracy", Current History, May 1954; Flynn, "Have We the Brains to Be Free?", The Freeman, Mar. 23, 1953.


10. Two specific proposals: Kennan, Realities of Foreign Policy; and Streit, Union Now, Chs. I-XIII. Suggested but not required: Morgenthau, In Defense of the National Interest.

11. The psychology of international tension. Freud, Civilization and Its Discontents; and Murphy, Human Nature and Enduring Peace, Chs. I & IV. Suggested but not required were: Newcomb, Social Psychology, last 2 chapters; and Hoffer, The True Believer.

12. Discussion of preliminary drafts of term papers

13. Discussion of preliminary drafts of term papers.
Three students representing the departments of psychology, history, and English, meeting individually with instructor for a one-hour tutorial each week. 2-3 page papers due almost every week.

One joint session was held (three students and instructor) after all had seen Arthur Miller's "The Crucible."

General Topic: "Are Knowledge and Peace Compatible?"

Week 1: General discussion
2: Vercors, You Shall Know Them
3: A.N. Whitehead, "Science and the Modern World, chs. 1 and 3 and parts of Dampier-Whetham Cambridge Readings in the Literature of Science or Einstein and Infeld The Evolution of Physics or Dampier A History of Science
also look at Gamow Mr. Tompkins in Wonderland
4: Charles Morgan The Burning Glass
and A. Schlesinger "The Oppenheimer Case" in Atlantic Monthly Oct. 1954
5: Alan Paton Too Late the Phalarope
6: David Reisman The Lonely Crowd
7: See Arthur Miller's play "The Crucible" at Hedgerow Theater
8: Parts of Machiavelli The Prince
and of Plato Republic
9: E. Hemingway The Old Man and the Sea
and C. Fry The Dark is Light Enough
10: Paul Tillich The Courage to Be.

For the remaining sessions each student followed a different course:
Student A: Kafka The Castle
Wm. James The Varieties of Religious Experience
Ghiselin The Creative Process
T. R. Kelly Testament of Devotion

Student B: A. Hitler My Struggle
A. Bullock Hitler, a Study in Tyranny
Plato Ion
Ghiselin The Creative Process

Student C: Houton Up from the Ape (?)
H.O. Taylor The Medieval Mind

C. THE SMALLER SEMINAR (L.A. POST)

Students: Dixon, (Philosophy); Flint, (Economics); Hamburger, (Chemistry); and Masterson, (English).

Preliminary—Duggan, The Little Emperors-Huxley, Brave New World
Hamburger, Monkey (Chinese tale)-Stewart, Earth Abides/Essay: so what?


Fifth -- Chinese Painting -- Walt Whitman: what is Whitman trying to communicate? -- Lucas Bridges, The uttermost part of the earth: how should the natives of Tierra del Fuego have been treated? -- Fukuzawa, Autobiography: report.

Sixth -- Life of Henry Ford: what are the criteria of success? -- Fromm, Man for Himself: where does a man get his drive? -- Royce, Loyalties: ought there to be an absolute loyalty? -- Dante, The Divine Comedy: what is Dante's cosmic consciousness?

Also a brief statement on the question: how do I know what I ought to do, want to do, have to do?

In this group we felt our way, taking assignments as men were interested and reading books that would enlarge the horizon and suggest new ways of looking at things. Before the end students were making serious reports and genuinely seeking to get and give insight into fundamental problems of life and philosophy. It was rated from 70 to 85 about. But the low mark was for not working, not for lack of wit.
Minute 1: The Minutes of the meetings of December 6, 1954, and January 17, 1955, were approved as read.

Minute 2: In connection with the prospect of additional faculty housing in Merion Hall and Merion Annex, which are to be thoroughly renovated when they cease to be student dormitories, the faculty authorized the President to appoint a special committee with the purpose of considering any change in the rules now in effect with regard to the allocation of faculty housing. The faculty also endorsed the additional suggestion that at a later date the entire problem of faculty housing should be reconsidered, in proper relation to faculty compensation.

Adjourned 12:10 P.M.

Gerhard Friedrich
Secretary
Regular meeting
President White presiding

February 17, 1955
11:10 A.M.

Minute 1: The Minutes of the meeting of January 20, 1955, were approved, after deletion of the term "thoroughly" as a modifier in connection with the renovation of Merion for faculty occupancy.

Minute 2: The faculty accepted the Curriculum Committee's report on progression in academic work, together with the Student Curriculum Committee's report on progress (see Annexes 1 and 2), and approved the "recommendations" in Part I, pages 2 and 3, with the understanding that they are in the nature of suggestions intended to encourage further consideration and appropriate action by the various departments. The faculty thanked the Curriculum Committee for its efforts.

Minute 3: Because of lack of time, consideration of a revised draft of Part II of the report previously submitted by the Special Committee on Campus Security Checks by Federal Agencies (see Minute 1 of December 6, 1954) was postponed until the next faculty meeting.

Adjourned 12:05 P.M.

Gerhard Friedrich
Secretary
Report of the Curriculum Committee on

Progression in Academic Work

(Please bring to Faculty Meeting on February 17)

INTRODUCTION

1. The Problem

On the subject of the educational philosophy of Haverford College, the 1953-54 Catalogue sets forth the following objectives:

"...intellectual integrity, independence of judgment, the imaginative grasp of interrelationships, and the capacity to do independent work. Mastery of facts and of the techniques of research is always important, but even more so is the desire and moral capacity to use these skills for worthwhile ends."

With the conviction that this philosophy is fundamentally sound and in an effort to implement it even more effectively in the future than in the past, the Curriculum Committee presents this report on "progression" in our academic work. The Committee undertook this study for two reasons. First, it has been said that Haverford students have not always been challenged to strive for the greatest intellectual and moral maturity of which they are capable. One of the reasons for this, it is alleged, is the absence of adequate opportunity for systematic progression in their work.

Second, it has been said that some course prerequisites do not seem justified since the courses that require them do not actually build on them. Examples frequently mentioned are the large elementary courses, especially English 11-12 and Social Science 11-12, which many subsequent related courses do not seem to take sufficiently into account.

2. Assumptions Underlying This Report

The Committee uses the word "progression" in this report to refer to the means which may be employed to encourage the continuous development of a student's intellectual and moral maturity.

The Committee believes that progression is a desirable and important element in the educational process and should be fostered wherever it seems appropriate.

The Committee recognises, however, that progression is only one aspect of the total educational philosophy of Haverford and that no two fields of learning can, or should, apply the principle in the same way.

Hence, the Committee seeks to do no more than present a number of possibilities to the faculty in the hope that they will be studied and utilised wherever they seem relevant.

Progression and Interdepartmental Coordination

1. Foundation Courses of General Interest

Certain elementary courses are taken by a large number of students and therefore offer a widely shared foundation of experience for more advanced courses to build upon. The two taken by all students, as already mentioned, are English 11-12 and Social Science 11-12. Among other courses that are being taken by more than 50 students during the second semester of the 1954-1955 academic year are the following: Humanities 21-22 (80 students), Chemistry 14 (65), Economics 22 (63), Physics 13-14 (60), Political Science 22 (57), French 13-14 (55), and Philosophy 12 (54).

As one might expect, the advanced courses which make the most direct and intensive use of this foundation experience are the science courses which build on the basic science courses, and the language courses which build on their respective elementary courses. There is far less correlation between the other elementary courses and the advanced courses of all the varied departments that range above them.
The Committee feels that some of the elementary courses, (other than the basic science and language courses), particularly those to which large numbers of students are exposed, might well be designed with more direct reference to the students' later work. Conversely, some of the more advanced courses might be more effectively correlated with related foundation courses. A few specific suggestions aimed at achieving these objectives are set forth at the end of this report.

2. **Interdepartmental Coordination at the More Advanced Level**

It is doubtful whether full advantage is now being taken of opportunities for progression from one course to another across departmental lines. Some courses based upon prerequisites in other departments do not seem actually to be designed with specific reference to those courses. In other cases, where such prerequisites do not exist at present, there may be justification for instituting them.

Within departments there is a wide range of variations on this theme of progression. On the one hand, there is the "minimalist" school of thought in which might be included, for example, the departments of Political Science, Philosophy, and Sociology. In general, junior and senior courses in these departments are not based on any prerequisite other than a sophomore introductory course, and, in some cases, e.g. a number of upper class courses in philosophy, there is not even this requirement.

At the other end of the scale, there is the "maximalist" school of thought in which might be included the Mathematics, Chemistry, and German departments. Here there is stricter progression from the freshman to the senior years, with each course built upon a previous one, although there may be variety of routes to the summit.

Between these two alternatives lies a middle ground occupied by such departments as English and Economics. In these fields, there are some junior course prerequisites for some senior courses, but the choice is less limited than in the "maximalist" camp.

Those who favor greater emphasis on progression say that 1) the continuous development of certain aptitudes in a particular area is one of the best ways of strengthening a student's maturity, and 2) whatever may be lost in range of choice is compensated for by increased opportunity for disciplined development. Those who question any further emphasis on progression say that 1) while some progression is desirable, what now exists is probably sufficient; 2) breadth is necessary as well as depth, and to emphasize the latter any further might lead to over-specialization, and 3) further progression would unduly restrict the choice of courses available to students.

Balancing these considerations, the Committee believes that there are greater opportunities for valid progression than have yet been fully explored. Certainly there is no substitute for the experience of continuous and disciplined penetration of the successive stages of a particular field.

**Recommendations to The Faculty**

The Curriculum Committee recommends that this report be studied by the faculty with the hope that it may suggest useful avenues of future development. Particular attention might be given to the following possibilities.

1. There might well be more exchange of information among all faculty members teaching related courses.

   a. Among departments, this applies particularly to faculty concerned with courses with large enrollments. It also applies to other related courses, including languages that can be useful in the study of other subjects. The relation of history to other courses needs further exploration.

   b. It is equally applicable to faculty and courses within a particular department.

   c. As for the means of this exchange, the minimum might be the circulation of syllabuses, reading lists, and other relevant materials. There might also be personal consultation regarding the planning and teaching of these courses. There might be some rotation of instructors among the courses. Finally it might prove profitable to hold special meetings of the faculty to discuss those courses that have the widest relevance for the entire faculty and student body such as English 11-12, Social Science 11-12 and Haverford 100. Departments might wish to explore means of taking care of hardships suffered by non-major, should the number of prerequisite courses be increased.
2. Within departments, efforts might be made to experiment with further progress in a limited area, involving the reorganization of only one or two courses. This experience might then provide a sounder basis than now exists for deciding what direction future development of the curriculum should take. Project and reading courses have been used in this connection in the past and can, perhaps, be so used to an even greater extent in the future. In any case, within departments, students need a clearer picture of the sequence of courses and the reasons for this sequence.

3. Within individual courses, there are also many opportunities for encouraging the maximum individual development of students' capabilities. These include: additional or alternative reading, papers and other projects, and making a course a double credit course for some or all of the students.
STUDENT CURRICULUM COMMITTEE REPORT ON PROGRESSION

Introduction

1. We have dealt only with those types of progression which we feel submit themselves to committee investigation.
   a) progression in knowledge; that is in facts, ideas, historical background, and so forth.
   b) progression in critical abilities; that is the use of analytical tools such as logic and vocabulary, a sense of problems and themes, and perception.

2. The "areas" to which we have looked to find progression are:
   a) within departments
   b) between departments
   c) in the individual students, a consideration which will appear at various places in the report.

3. We feel that progression can be achieved primarily by working on:
   a) departmental organization
   b) course content
   c) information and guidance for the student, discussed under the above categories for convenience.

Progression within departments

1. Through departmental organization
   a) It is important that the development of material in a department be shown to the student. Each department should have for the prospective major a clear and complete statement of the goals and how they are to be achieved by the student, and at the end of the sophomore should have a conference with prospective majors to discuss this problem more fully; at least once a semester the major adviser should confer with students to assess their progress along the path outlined.
   b) Students find it of benefit if certain areas of study are marked out for them. In some departments (such as Political Science) these are inferred when each professor takes a different area; other departments (such as Phil) give the student a choice of topics on the comprehensive (perhaps the English department might do this); the system of "70" courses used by the Economics department handles this problem satisfactorily.
   c) The basic course in each department is most important and should establish a foundation for as many of the elements of progression as is possible. The committee sees some neglect in training for the use of analytical tools (Sociology 22 could be a course in social research, and perhaps Phil 12 might be a logic course) and a sense of "problems" (Phil 11 is made up on this basis, and it might be useful in history.)
   d) The system of pre-requisites in the department is important to progression. The committee feels that if a course is to have certain pre-requisites, then the course should be firmly based on the preparation demanded, both for the sake of the student who has taken the prior course(s) and of the student who is discouraged from "jumping into" the course; however, the covering of pre-requisite material outside the classroom should be encouraged (German issues a list of summer readings for students wishing to go from 11-12 to 15-16.)
   e) The "expansion" of department offerings is an aid to the personal progression of the student, and can be accomplished without overburdening the faculty. Project courses and reading courses are one excellent means of expansion to meet individual needs; Bryn Mawr courses offer another way, and they should be much more heavily publicised, perhaps included in the list of courses distributed at registration time.
   f) A program of outside readings for majors (as in the natural sciences) can help the student to correlate, as he goes, his various experiences in the department.
2. Thru course content

a) The classroom technique of the professor can be important for a student's sense of progression. Specific discussions in class on course development and its relationship to other courses might be very useful; a technique of drawing illustrations from, and implications in, other areas is also helpful; if two professors in a department take different approaches to the same material, reference to the other approach helps highlight the issue for the student; inviting other professors into a course for particular lectures or discussions might be a useful device here.

b) Whenever possible, the content of a course should be adjustable to individual backgrounds and needs, and students should be involved in the planning of a course (reading lists, topics for papers, etc.) Flexibility in course assignments, as discussed in recommendation No. 3 of the faculty report, is useful here, as are courses whose specific content is decided by the professor with students (French 25-26 and Phil 63-64 are of this type, and perhaps other advanced courses such as the English "60" series would lend themselves to this approach.)

c) The problem of gearing a course to students with different backgrounds and interests could perhaps be solved by having split sections for certain courses (Physics 15-24 could be divided between those with and without calculus; the basic social science courses could be divided between sophomores and upperclassmen plus sophomore pre-majors, etc; (this last is something that might well deserve a study of its own).

Progression between departments

1. Departmental organization

a) Certain departments make "natural" partners (e.g. Sociology-Psychology, Math-Physics, Chemistry-Biology, Economics-Political Science, etc.) and perhaps this condition might be exploited more fully. Combined field courses are especially satisfactory aids to progression, when they have pre-requisites in both departments (such as Biology 35 and 41, and advanced Physics and Astronomy courses; might Phil 35 have Humanities 21-22 or English 41-42 as a pre-requisite, for instance); this introduces the notion of "joint majors" that has been suggested, another matter that would deserve full examination.

b) At times, a contrasting situation prevails, where a course applies equally to a variety of fields. Here, alternate pre-requisites are used to advantage (as in Geography 32.)

c) It would seem that a common historical base is one of the most fundamental ties between developments in different areas of study; the committee, after considerable goading by its chairman, feels that each department ought to insure that background historical material is covered, either through separate courses, in each course, or by some other suitable device.

d) Periodic conferences with the major adviser can be of great help to the student in drawing together the material he has covered, and they should be institutionalized.

2. Thru course content

a) Material in general courses which most or all students take should be used whenever possible (Perhaps issues raised in Freshman English and Social Science 11-12 could be discussed in Phil courses, for instance); we endorse recommendation No. 1 of the faculty report.

b) Class technique, as discussed above, is also important to inter-departamental progression.

The special problem of the language departments

1. The language departments are unique in their unusual importance as instruments to other academic ends. This problem might be met in several ways:
a) Many non-majors require only a reading knowledge of a language (for history, science, literature, etc.) and perhaps one section of each elementary course might be set up on this basis; this suggestion deserves separate study, in the future.

b) The secondary interest of the non-major may be in the cultural and historical background of a linguistic tradition. For this purpose, full courses not requiring advanced reading ability (such as Spanish 15-16) might be useful.

2. Other special points

a) For the student whose interest is in cultivating literary taste and perception, references to developments in other language cultures (as in German 32 and 37) might prove helpful (this applies as well to English.)

b) For the benefit of the major, the language house experience might be improved by giving fellowships to foreign students to live in the appropriate house for a year.

Mitigating Circumstances

1. The student committee recognizes that there are certain hindrances to progression that it may be impossible to overcome:

a) purely mechanical considerations such as alternate-year courses, professorial absences, different professors teaching the same course from different points of view (e.g., ethics) and limitations of faculty time, especially in two-man departments.

b) inadequate preparation, either in high school or in general Haverford courses (the Social Science 11-12 course has, in the past, failed to lay a satisfactory foundation for work in the social sciences).

c) material that does not easily lend itself to progressive building (courses in religious literature are out of the mainstream of philosophy); certain departments have too much elementary material to cover to permit extensive progression (e.g., Phil and History).

d) some departments are particularly susceptible to invasion by "aliens" (again Phil and History, and also English) and are thus hindered from achieving internal progression.

2. There are also certain considerations which would militate against a full-scale attempt at departmental and inter-departmental progression:

a) The desirability of serving non-majors as well as majors; certain advanced courses with a broad appeal, which could be taken by non-majors without many pre-requisites, if possible without even the sophomore introductory course, should be set aside by each department.

b) Progression is essentially an individual matter with each student, and a case can be made for giving him maximum possible freedom in his choice of courses; for the same reason, it seems likely that any attempt to force courses of an intensely personal nature (such as many Phil and English courses) into an overall pattern of progression might in the end hinder progression for the individual student.

The problem of greater specialization

1. Elements tending toward greater specialization:

a) Expanding the number of courses in a department and tightening the system of pre-requisites invites greater concentration in that department.

b) Organizing comprehensive exams with a choice of topics tends toward greater specialization within a department.

c) Requiring preparation in related departments for certain courses implies greater specialization within broad areas of study.

d) Any program for aligning material between courses means that certain peripheral issues will be neglected.
2. Elements tending away from specialization:

a) Any program which would increase the significance of material in various fields for the individual student is widening his understanding and perception.

b) Specialization does not necessarily imply exclusion. It is likely that only by going deeply into at least one problem can the student discover the issues which are common to his field and perhaps to all of intellectual endeavor.

3. The student committee feels that the suggestions made in this report will widen rather than narrow the intellectual horizons of the individual.

Peroration

Aside from suggestions for change in the structure of courses and departments, the committee would like to emphasize the points which touch on the relationship between student and professor, since opportunities for progression are to no purpose if these opportunities never come home to the student. The "major adviser system" ought to be strengthened, and in each course the professor should indicate clearly connections with related material in and out of the department or contrasts with other approaches and points of view on the material at hand. This latter suggestion rests very directly upon faculty action on point one under "Recommendations" in the faculty report.
Regular meeting March 7, 1955
President White presiding 4:10 P.M.

Minute 1: The Minutes of the meeting of February 17, 1955, were approved as read.

Minute 2: Part II of the report previously submitted by the Special Committee on Campus Security Checks by Federal Agencies was resubmitted in a version further revised. After considerable searching discussion the faculty found itself unable at the time to reach any agreement on the question of security inquiries.

Minute 3: The Special Committee on Faculty Housing submitted a series of recommendations with particular reference to the nine apartments which will become available for faculty occupancy in Marion by the fall of 1955. The Committee was asked to distribute copies of its recommendations to all faculty members for study and individual comment, and was authorized on the basis of such further consideration by the faculty to prepare a final report for use by the President at the next meeting of the Board of Managers.

Adjourned 6:10 P.M.

Gerhard Friedrich
Secretary
Regular meeting  
President White presiding  
March 24, 1955  
11:10 A.M.

Minute 1: The Minutes of the meeting of March 7, 1955, were approved as read.

Minute 2: The Committee on Non-Academic Instruction announced that it hopes to find a more respectable label for its part of the college program, and was encouraged in this quest.

Minute 3: Vice-President MacIntosh asked the advice of the faculty on the problematical case of a totally deaf but otherwise well-prepared applicant for next year whose probable area of special interest would be the humanities and social sciences. The faculty expressed itself in favor of considering him for admission.

Minute 4: The students' Honor System Committee proposed a revision of the statement in the Haverford College Handbook for 1954-1955, page 29, which applies to the documentation of papers prepared outside of class (see Annex 1). Consideration of this matter was postponed until the next faculty meeting.

Adjourned 12:05 P.M.

Gerhard Friedrich
Secretary
March 22, 1955

Dear Gilbert White:

The Honor System Committee has recently considered the problems raised by that section of the Honor System which deals with the documentation of outside papers.

The regulation of the Students' Association which deals with this matter is as follows: "All papers, theses, etc., shall represent the student's original unaided effort, unless arrangements to the contrary have been made with the faculty member concerned." At present, this regulation is being interpreted according to the following guide which appears in the Freshman Handbook.

Under the Honor System, papers prepared outside of class are to be the work of the student who submits them, except insofar as indebtedness to books, articles, or people is specifically acknowledged. The sources of facts, ideas, phrases, arrangement of material, etc. are to be indicated except in cases where the material is so current as to be common property.

Any failure to live up to this standard is a violation of the Honor System and must be reported to the Students' Council.

The administration of the requirement, as it is presently being interpreted, under the Honor System has serious disadvantages. First, a conscientious and literal acceptance of the standard would place an overwhelming burden upon the student. Second, experience has indicated that the present standard is so indefinite that students can not clearly understand what is actually required in specific situations. Third, in the case of a suspected violation it is nearly impossible for the Council to determine whether the student intended any deceit in omitting a footnote which would have been desirable or whether he was even conscious of his dependence. For these reasons the present standard is often not followed and there is a certain amount of uneasiness as from time to time students consider what Council judgment on their own papers might be should the present standard ever be rigorously enforced.

After talking with a number of students and faculty members the Committee would like to make this suggestion: that
under the Honor System only two things be required for the documen-
tation of outside papers:

1. A credit for direct quotations or very close paraphrasing.

2. An accurate bibliography.

Any failure to live up to these two standards would constitute a violation of the Honor System which would be reported to the Council.

Under this revision each professor would be free to require any degree of documentation of facts, ideas, etc. that he wishes and to insist on any standard of individuality in a student's work. These further requirements would be completely his own, however, and he would be free to deal with them as he sees fit.

The revision might be made by changing the regulation of the Students' Association. If it meets with the approval of the faculty, however, it would be easier for them simply to accept the revision as the interpretation of the regulation which would then replace the present statement in the Freshman Handbook.

Would the faculty be willing to adopt this revised standard or a similar one?

Sincerely,

Charles Brainard
For the Honor System Committee
The new standard for the documentation of papers under the Honor System.

All quotations should be placed within quotation marks.

All quotations or close paraphrasings which are of sentence length or more should be credited—either in a footnote or in the body of the paper.

All articles and books used in preparing a paper (either directly, or indirectly through questioning someone who has read the work) must be listed in a bibliography. When the paper deals with only one work, as in a book review, the bibliography may be omitted.

Any failure to live up to these requirements constitutes a violation of the Honor System which must be reported to the Council either by the violator or by the student or professor who detects it.
Regular meeting
President White presiding

April 11, 1955
4:10 P.M.

Minute 1: The faculty, Herman Somers presiding, elected Field Haviland as its representative on the Board of Managers for the term 1955-57, with Howard Teaf as alternate, and also elected Wallace MacCaffrey for the unexpired term of Holland Hunter, who will be on leave during 1955-56, with Jerry White as alternate. The Secretary of the Board of Managers was informed accordingly.

Minute 2: The Minutes of the meeting of March 24, 1955, were approved as read.

Minute 3: The Curriculum Committee recommended and the faculty approved inclusion in the college catalog of History 41-42 as a reading course, with appropriate indication of the prerequisites and restrictions which will apply to that course.

Minute 4: The Curriculum Committee recommended and the faculty approved for inclusion in the college catalog a major in history and literature of England and America (see Annex 1). Admission of a student to the program of this joint major will, as in all cases of joint majors, be subject to approval by the Dean.

Minute 5: The Committee on Fellowships and Prizes recommended and the faculty approved the selection of Jay Noble as next year's First Cope Fellow, and of Johns Hopkins as the Second Cope Fellow.

Minute 6: The Committee on Fellowships and Prizes informed the faculty that, in view of the comparative lack of student interest in various prizes now offered by the college, it would favor transfer of such money as may be legally available for the financing of an annual publication to bring together outstanding student work done at Haverford, as suggested by the students.

Minute 7: The Committee still named "on Non-Academic Instruction" made an emphatic plea that it be officially recognized either as the Committee on Arts and Social Skills or as the Committee on Arts and Social Service. Faculty reaction to these alternatives being varied, the Committee was again asked to give further thought to the question of an appropriate label.

Minute 8: Consideration of the revision proposed by the students' Honor System Committee with regard to the rules which govern the documentation of papers prepared outside of class (see Minutes of March 24, 1955, Annex 1) was again postponed until the next meeting.

Adjourned 5:48 P.M.

Gerhard Friedrich
Secretary
HISTORY AND LITERATURE

The major in History and Literature allows qualified students to obtain a knowledge of the relation between history and literature in two distinct periods or centuries.

A student should take six semester courses in English and American literature, and six in English and American history, above the elementary level.

Of these courses, one in each department should be a seminar or project course. Students may enter this major program only by consent of the chairman of both departments. History 11-12 is a prerequisite for this major.

Notes: (not for catalogue entry)

1. The student will have one supervisor of his work.

2. The student will receive a written copy of his plan of study; copies of this plan will be sent to the chairman of both departments and to the Dean.

3. The 100 course for this major will consist of an opportunity for independent review.

4. The major requires no new administrative machinery. No new courses will be necessary.
Regular meeting
President White presiding
April 21, 1955
11:10 A.M.

Minute 1: The chairman of the Curriculum Committee asked that, for the sake of consistent terminology in the college catalog, the term "joint major" in his recommendations to the faculty at the meeting of April 11 be changed to "interdepartmental major." With this change, the Minutes of the meeting of April 11, 1955, were approved.

Minute 2: The Curriculum Committee presented the following recommendations, which the faculty approved:

Russian 201 and Russian 203 shall be included among the limited electives, under humanities, section b;
Biology 21-22 shall be included among the limited electives, under natural sciences, group a;
In the catalog statement concerning the grading of a student who failed the first semester of a hyphenated year course, but has been permitted to continue in the second semester (see catalog for 1954-1955, page 42, paragraph 4), the phrase "will be given a grade of 60" shall be changed to read "will be given credit";
The Psychology Department shall be permitted to add two new courses, namely Experimental Social Psychology (Psychology 36) and Communication and Propaganda (Psychology 42);
The English Department shall be permitted, on one-year approval, to revive two courses formerly offered, namely a first-semester course in Eighteenth-Century Literature (English 35) and Chaucer and the Chaucerians (English 64).

Minute 3: In the third act of a name-giving drama, Kenneth Woodrofe treated the faculty to an oration. In response to his eloquent plea to accentuate the positive and eliminate the negative, the faculty approved a proposal that the erstwhile Committee on Non-Academic Instruction shall henceforth be called the Arts and Service Committee.

Minute 4: Ariel Iosey presented to the faculty a proposal on the unresolved question of what should be the faculty's policy in dealing with loyalty inquiries about students, and asked for comments and criticisms on the tentative suggestions (see Annex 1).

Minute 5: The twice postponed consideration of the proposed revision of the Honor System rules governing documentation of papers prepared outside of class, was undertaken against the pressure of time and the roar and din of the students in the dining-hall celebrating the beginning of Campus Day. Although several faculty members expressed reservations, the proposed revision was approved by the faculty (see Annex 1 of the Minutes of March 24, 1955).

Adjourned 12:15 P.M.

Gerhard Friedrich
Secretary
In spite of past difficulties of arriving at a general agreement on a way of dealing with loyalty investigations, it seems to us that there was a large measure of agreement on several issues. The following suggestions are based on the assumption that most faculty members agree that the present conditions regarding to interviews between faculty and government agents constitute a danger to free classroom discussion and the examination of radical ideas.

It seems to us that the crux of the disagreement lies in the precise evaluation of what constitutes disloyalty and in the precise way one's evaluation of loyalty and disloyalty should be communicated to the government agent. Although each of us may have strong feelings of how one should behave in an interview, we feel that discussion of this can at the very most serve the function of communicating our views to each other. It is hard to see how, in view of the differences of opinion, one can lay down a general policy for all to follow. Rather than attempting to modify the previous proposals with the object of pleasing everybody and thus run the risk of pleasing no one, we would like to suggest an alternative procedure.

We feel that the weakness of the present situation is two-fold: (1) it can involve the making of accusations without confronting the accused, and (2) because of the many communication steps involved — starting with the original interview and ending eventually with the final dossier in the government files — there is ample room for misunderstanding and misinterpretation.

In order to make sure that the precise and identical statement of the faculty member should end both in the government files as well as with the student himself, we suggest that all interviews should be conducted in writing and that the student should receive a carbon copy of all statements relating to his loyalty and security.  

We realize that written interviews have several drawbacks. They are time-consuming and thus may not furnish the government agencies with all the material they might like to obtain. On the other hand, these very drawbacks also constitute the strength of the proposal. Although time-consuming, they may be more considered; although less prompt with information, they will more likely lack the hearsay and the unfounded rather than the directly experienced and the substantiated.

We also suggest that the faculty express its support of those individual members who feel for conscientious reasons that they are unable to participate in an interview in which the loyalty of a student is under examination. Thus the faculty would go on record of supporting each individual member for his own particular way of evaluating loyalty and his own degree of reticence or effusiveness in communicating this information as long as the communication is done in writing and the student in question is confronted with it.
FACULTY OF HAVERFORD COLLEGE

Regular meeting
President White presiding

May 19, 1955
10:30 A.M.

Minute 1: The Minutes of the meeting of April 21, 1955, were approved as read.

Minute 2: The Special Committee on the Graduate Curriculum submitted a report including three recommendations (see Annex 1). After considerable questioning and discussion, the faculty approved the recommendations, with the specific understanding that, if a director is appointed on a Philadelphia funds, appointment on that financial basis should be only for one year.

Minute 3: In connection with the recommendations and the action referred to above, the faculty requested that both the possibility and the advisability of ultimately diverting the income from the Moses Brown Fund for undergraduate purposes be thoroughly examined.

Minute 4: The Special Committee on Security Checks submitted a revised statement (see Annex 2), with the recommendation that it be considered as a series of advices to be included in the "Information for Members of the Faculty." The faculty accepted the committee's statement in this sense and for this purpose, with the provision that the wording be further revised before printing. The faculty expressed appreciation to the members of the committee for the time and thought spent in clarifying the issues involved. The faculty may decide later what further publicity should be given to the statement.

Minute 5: The faculty endorsed a proposal that the representatives to the Board of Managers and their alternates should meet with Ted Benfey to discuss with him the views expressed in his letter to the faculty (see Annex 3).

Adjourned 12 noon.

Gerhard Friedrich
Secretary
A report for presentation to the faculty.

May 19, 1955

The special committee of the faculty appointed to consider what program of graduate work should be offered at Haverford met repeatedly this winter and spring. This study was preceded by a review of the problem by the Curriculum Committee which resulted in the "Preliminary Report on Graduate Work" and by a series of meetings of the STA Committee which resulted in the recommendations to the faculty which outlined the Graduate Curriculum in STA for 55-56.

The college has undertaken a responsibility in accepting the gift of T. Wistar Brown in establishing the Moses Brown Fund to furnish instruction to a group of adult workers in the field of religious and social service. It was originally suggested that this instruction would be for Haverford graduates and others, but that undergraduates might also be admitted to the courses.

At present the income of the Moses Brown Fund amounts to about $31,463. This is used as follows: added to principal $2,146, to graduate fellowships $5,000, the balance ($14,317) to faculty salaries and the general operations of the college.

From 1917 to 1927 the available income from this fund was for the T. Wistar Brown Graduate School. After that the income was used for instruction and scholarships for T.W. B. fellows who were mostly graduates of Quaker colleges and who pursued individual programs of study under the supervision of certain members of the faculty and in regular undergraduate courses. Most of these students lived at the Graduate House, (now the French House). In the summer of 1943 there was a short-lived "CPS European Unit" of 15 men. In the years 1943-46 the resources for graduate instruction were devoted to the Reconstruction and Relief Program. This involved 56 students, mostly women. The T. Wistar Brown program of individual programs of study in particular departments was resumed in 1946 with most of the students living and taking some courses at Pendle Hill. In 1951 the present Graduate Curriculum in Social and Technical Assistance was instituted. This has continued for four years with only slight modifications. To date 58 students have been enrolled. Next year a modified STA curriculum will be offered. This has been reported to the faculty and is described in a special brochure and in the forthcoming college catalog.

We think that Haverford should in the future offer a graduate curriculum of special courses for a group of students with common interests, in keeping with the intent of T. Wistar Brown, and that the purpose and nature of the program should be similar to that of the present STA curriculum. There might be a greater emphasis on the work of community development. It would be essential that we obtain financial resources in addition to those now available, so that recruitment, placement, instruction, provision for adequate fellowships, direction of the whole program including a field project, and the promotion of the program including fund raising, be adequately provided for.

Recommendations

(1) We recommend that a director with the qualifications of a Phillips Visitor be found to undertake the development of this curriculum and to find the funds to support it, starting this fall.

(2) If this is not possible, but if there are prospects that it might be possible to do so the next year, then we recommend that the STA curriculum as planned for 1955-56 be continued through 1956-57 only and the promotion of a Graduate Curriculum in Social and Technical Assistance be continued during that year.

(3) If there are no such prospects and if graduate work here must be conducted on the funds now available for that purpose, then we recommend that the present STA curriculum be abandoned and that the arrangement be revived whereby graduates of Quaker colleges and others be accepted for individual programs of study under the supervision of certain departments.

Henry J. Cadbury
John D. Campbell
H. Field H aviland, Jr.
Howard M. Teaf, Jr.

Theodore B. Hetzel, Chairman
Holland Hunter
Clarence E. Pickett
Statement of the Haverford College Faculty on Government Security Checks 1/
May 19, 1955

1. Chief Justice Holmes once stated that we must retain in this country the "free trade in ideas — that the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market." 2/ Our primary concern about the security program of the Federal Government is that students and faculty members should not avoid controversial topics or unpopular positions for fear that these may be held against them in the future.

2. The basic assumption of the security program is that the Government has a right to, and indeed must, protect itself from disloyalty and subversion. Ascertaining the loyalty of any individual or the possibility of future acts of subversion by him, however, is fraught with danger. Under present security regulations it inevitably involves considerations of beliefs or opinions of both the person being investigated and the person being asked for information. 3/ We must consider carefully what information should make us question a man's loyalty or think of him as a possible security risk, and what information we should pass on to security investigators.

3. Let us first look at two general considerations, apart from any special features which may exist because of the nature of an academic community. First, the spoken or written word or the reading or studying of certain materials is far removed from actions. To act requires more than intellectual assent. Often we do not know what we believe until we are challenged to act upon our beliefs. Second, few people reveal to others their deepest thoughts and feelings; and even when they do, opinions which are voiced are easily misinterpreted.

1/ This statement is based in part on the information contained in the appended memorandum to the faculty by the Special Committee on Security Checks.


3/ Some information specifically required in a full field check under the existing security program relates to beliefs and opinions — for example, "Membership in, or affiliation or sympathetic association with, any foreign or domestic organization, association, movement, etc. which is totalitarian, Fascist, Communist or subversive . . . "(underlining ours). In addition, the regulations state that information collected should not necessarily be limited to that which is specifically required; in practice it may be directly related to opinions or beliefs. See appendix memorandum.
Security statement

4. In addition to these two general considerations, there are certain special features of a college education which must be taken into account in arriving at judgments of loyalty or riskiness of members of the college community. One of the aims of education at college is to question and shake opinions and beliefs previously arrived at largely from knowledge and experience of others and to form opinions which have been tested by the individual himself. The student is exposed to new ideas put forward by faculty members, by other students, or in reading, and has four years in which to find himself before taking a responsible position in society. During four years he is asked to look with an open mind at different theories and philosophies. He is also encouraged to try them out in experience. Many students go through a series of divergent yet passionately held philosophical convictions while at college. They may defend each strongly, this being one way of testing it. The espousal by some students in discussion or papers of ideas considered subversive outside the campus, must therefore be recognized as normal activity in a college.

Indeed, it is the person who has completely uninterested in controversial problems when in college who turns in times of crisis to movements advocating treasonable acts for lack of training in analyzing the claims and social interpretations of such movements. Experience shows that those who tried to understand controversial issues are usually less likely to be taken in by panaceas. An active interest in such issues may be more a sign of loyalty than ground for questioning a man's loyalty.

5. It follows from what has been said that there must exist a special relationship of trust among students and faculty in their professional association. Members of the college community should feel confident that expression of their ideas will be regarded as a strictly professional matter. We believe that this relationship of trust is indispensable to a college community if it is to serve its proper function in society.

6. We believe further that if there is doubt expressed about the loyalty of one member of the college community by another, or about his safety as a security risk because of his thoughts, opinions, or beliefs, as distinct from his character or stability of personality, a full statement of the charge should be given in writing to the investigating authorities, a copy of which should go to the person being charged with disloyalty or potential subversion.

7. Finally, this report should be discussed with Federal security officials, in the hope that mutual understanding of the ideas contained in it might be reached. We suggest that the college attempt to arrange such a meeting.

Statement submitted by:

Philip W. Bell
O. Theodore Benfey
Holland H. Hunter
To the Chairman of the Board of Managers  
The members of the faculty  
The members of the administration

Dear friends,

Because there has been much questioning regarding my resignation, I wish to state the following:

I have resigned from Haverford College not because I have lost faith in it but because I believe in its future. I have resigned because friendship across creative differences means much to me and because the structure of the college is such as to prevent such friendships being formed or sustained. I have seen my friendship with Gilbert White systematically poisoned until the day after my resignation, when it was restored; I have seen my relationship with T.O. Jones never get beyond the level of mutual suspicion. I leave because I love Gilbert White, Millien Feldrum and T.O. Jones and cannot see deterioration of the relationship between us. I hope my leaving will not increase still further the suspicions and ill-feelings rife on the campus.

The college structure is built on the assumption of omniscience, omnipotence and omnipresence a) on the college level of the president b) on the department level of the department chairman. But no president is wise enough to solve the myriad tensions of a creative faculty and no department chairman is endowed with so much goodness that he can be given absolute power over the men in his department. Such a system worked in a period when almost all the permanent faculty were heads of department and when there was little difference of opinion about general educational policy. Neither of those conditions holds today. If I stayed, every difference of opinion on my part would be seen as the questioning of the authority of either the department chairman or the president. Under these conditions the question of the rightness or wrongness of the opinion would never be squarely faced.

The Society of Friends was founded as a revolt against hierarchic relationships in church or state. But Haverford College is built almost exactly on the medieval hierarchic church pattern. The college was founded when the spiritual life of the Society was at its low ebb. Such a hierarchic pattern inevitably leads to the departure or Gleichschaltung of the dissidents and the consequent dessication of creativity on campus. Truth cannot flourish except in a community where each inherently respects the other no matter what his opinions. Since any power struggle poisons the search for truth, the college must find a far more democratic form of organization, thus actualizing more closely the vision of early Friends. To such a community of scholars, where permanent members of the faculty and administration work as partners in the preservation, propagation and extension of truth, I would be glad one day to return.
If the faculty wishes to pursue this matter further, I propose that I state my case to the new members of the academic council, about to be elected or to the faculty representatives and alternates to the Board of managers, whichever the faculty meeting on Thursday decides.

If Haverford can find a creative solution to this problem of power, it will help materially in the lifting of the educational profession to the level of respect that is due it. The original university was a community of scholars. If we cannot return to something approaching this conception, there is little hope for modern education.

O. Theodor Benfey
Regular meeting
President White presiding

May 31, 1955
9:15 A.M.

Minute 1: The Minutes of the meeting of May 19, 1955, were approved as read.

Minute 2: The Curriculum Committee submitted a report on the optimum student course load (see Annex 1), including a number of suggestions for further consideration by the individual departments. Professor Sutton called attention to the various 4-credit-hours courses now offered by the College, especially laboratory courses, and proposed that these be allowed a 12-hours-per-week course load, and that three such courses be counted as equivalent to four 3-credit-hours courses with their 9-hours-per-week course load. After some discussion of questionable aspects, the faculty agreed that the proposal and its implications for the college curriculum as a whole should be carefully studied by the Curriculum Committee.

Minute 3: The Academic Council proposed and the faculty approved the consolidation of the two separate committees on the graduate program and on graduate students into a single committee.

Minute 4: The faculty approved the award of highest and high honors to the following men in the subjects indicated:

**HIGHEST HONORS:**
- Jay Arthur Noble - Chemistry

**HIGH HONORS:**
- Alexander Charles Allen - Chemistry
- Marc Allan Forman - Chemistry
- Johns Wilson Hopkins - Chemistry
- Cornelius E. Klots - Chemistry
- Morton Stanley Mandell - Chemistry
- Richard William Marek - English
- Harrison Crouse Raper - Music
- Peter Birnie-Bye Rosenberger - Philosophy
- David Chase Sutton - Physics

Minute 5: The faculty recommended to the Board of Managers that appropriate degrees be awarded to those students who have fulfilled the requirements.

Minute 6: Following out a concern voiced by Cletus Oakley the faculty instructed its representatives to the Board of Managers to seek formal assurance that, though members of the faculty are paid by twelve monthly checks, their term of service is understood to be limited to the regular academic year.

Minute 7: The faculty recorded its appreciation of the long and influential service of Professors John Kelly and Ned Snyder, who are retiring at the end of the current college year.
(May 31, 1955 - continued)

Minute 8: At the conclusion of his term of service, the secretary of the faculty was instructed to minute the faculty's satisfaction with his efforts to memorialize their proceedings during the past two years.

Minute 9: After substitution of the term "record" for the humorous synonym "memorialize," insisted on by Professor Post, the foregoing minutes were approved.

Adjourned 11:10 A.M.

Gerhard Friedrich
Secretary
Report of the Curriculum Committee
on
Optimum Student Course Load

(To be discussed at Faculty meeting on May 19.
Please bring with you.)

The Problem.

Various members of the faculty and student body have expressed a concern this year that the present five course load compels students to spend too much time on their studies and to juggle too many different subjects to give any one of them adequate attention. The Curriculum Committee has reviewed this problem and has reached certain conclusions which it now presents to the faculty. Unfortunately these conclusions could not benefit from the survey conducted by the Student Committee on Education regarding the use of student time, since that survey had not been completed when this report was written.

Amount of time to be devoted to studies.

The Committee recognizes that a considerable burden has resulted from the fact that some courses require more than the standard nine hours a week which the faculty has approved as the proper maximum load for each course.

The Committee has, therefore, reached these conclusions on this question:

1. The present standard load of nine hours per course, totaling 45 hours a week, is a proper maximum limit for the average student; it leaves sufficient time for rest and extra curricular activities. Does it leave time for independent reading?

2. No instructor should require more than this limit for any course, or feel any necessity to require less. The Committee notes with appreciation the decision of the Mathematics Department, as a result of the Committee's study, to reduce the Mathematics 11-12 course load to 9 hours a week. Other courses now exceeding this limit should be similarly reduced.

3. Instructors should also watch carefully for those few students who find the present load exceptionally heavy or light, and take whatever action seems desirable.

Number of Courses to be taken.

There is a strong feeling in some quarters that a student cannot do justice to five courses taken at the same time. The principal proposal is that four courses, at least during the last two years, would be preferable to the present five.
The Committee's conclusions and recommendations are as follows:

1. It seems desirable to keep the five course pattern for the first two years in order to give students an ample choice of courses on which to base their selection of a major.

2. For the last two years, the Committee calls attention to the fact that the means already exist by which the number of areas studied by a student in any particular semester may be reduced. These means include: double-credit courses (offered on an ad hoc or regular basis), departmental 100 courses, and the Waverford 100 course. By remaining within the present five-course framework for the time being, however, it is possible to experiment further with these different approaches, to maintain a certain degree of flexibility thereby allowing individual students to study five, four, or even fewer areas during a semester, and to avoid forcing the entire college community to shift to a new framework before we have fully explored the possibilities that lie within the present one.

3. Finally, the Committee wishes to call the faculty's attention to various means by which it is possible to reduce the pressure towards the end of each semester, particularly for Seniors during their final semester. These include: reading periods, earlier deadlines for course papers, and giving Seniors, in their second semester courses, grades based on their performances up to but not including the final examinations.
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FROM PILLAR TO POST
or
THE OTHER PEA SHOOTER

(A Frontier Ballad)

Preposterous Post spoke with posthaste
And a posterior grumble:
"Memorialize" must be erased;
"Record" (Post-bellum mumble;
By Greeks who gobbled such a gook
Post graduates were never shook!)
The faculty's collective look
Pursued the Postish bumble.