

University of Mississippi

eGrove

---

Clippings

James W. Silver Collection

---

9-1-1965

## The Case of Professor James W. Silver

Richard P. Adams

Frances C. Brown

Gladys Kammerer

Forrest W. Lacey

Follow this and additional works at: [https://egrove.olemiss.edu/jws\\_clip](https://egrove.olemiss.edu/jws_clip)

---

### Recommended Citation

Adams, Richard P.; Brown, Frances C.; Kammerer, Gladys; and Lacey, Forrest W., "The Case of Professor James W. Silver" (1965). *Clippings*. 31.

[https://egrove.olemiss.edu/jws\\_clip/31](https://egrove.olemiss.edu/jws_clip/31)

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the James W. Silver Collection at eGrove. It has been accepted for inclusion in Clippings by an authorized administrator of eGrove. For more information, please contact [egrove@olemiss.edu](mailto:egrove@olemiss.edu).

SEPTEMBER 1965

AUTUMN ISSUE

AAUP

**bulletin**

**Record of Council Meeting**

**Subversion, Progress, and Higher Education**

**Tribute to Alexander Meiklejohn**

**The Humanities, the Whore, and the Alderman**

**Research in Nigeria**

**Academic Freedom in Mississippi  
A Report of a Special Committee**

a publication of the American Association of University Professors

VOLUME 51 • NUMBER 4

SILVER JAMES W  
UNIV OF MISS/HISTORY  
UNIVERSITY MISS

# *Announcements and Reminders*

## **Fifty-Second Annual Meeting**

The Association's Fifty-Second Annual Meeting will be held on April 29-30, 1966, at the Dinkler-Plaza Hotel in Atlanta, Georgia.

## **Council Meeting**

The autumn meeting of the Association's Council will be held in the Conference Room of the American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., on Friday and Saturday, October 29 and 30. Council members will stay at the Dupont Plaza Hotel.

## **Gifts to the Academic Freedom Fund**

Members and friends of the Association are again encouraged to contribute, in however modest amounts, to the Association's permanently established Academic Freedom Fund (see Spring, 1959, *Bulletin*, pages 82-84) so that the Fund's invested principal may earn an annual sum sufficient to provide meaningful aid to individual teachers and faculties at institutions of higher education where significant threats to academic freedom arise. If anyone wishes to give support to the Academic Freedom Fund in the form of a bequest, he should address a letter of inquiry about appropriate testamentary language to the General Secretary.

## **Fall Membership Campaign**

The Association is conducting the final phase of the 1965 Membership Campaign. All chapters and conferences are asked to participate, as well as individual members at institutions where chapters have not yet been established. Attention is called to the application blank at the end of this issue.

## **Changes in Chapter Officers**

In order that Association records may be kept up-to-date, chapter secretaries are requested to notify the Washington Office of the names of chapter officers elected this spring.

## **Chapter *Bulletin* Subscriptions**

Chapters are reminded that they may enter *Bulletin* subscriptions in the names of administrative officers and board members at a special rate. The cost of each subscription is only fifty cents a year.

## **The Eighth Annual Self-Grading Compensation Survey**

Questionnaires for the 1965-66 Self-Grading Compensation Survey are being mailed to chapter and institution presidents. Since broad participation in the survey, both in reporting data and in authorizing publication of the compensation indices, will increase the usefulness of the program to all, chapter officers are urged to assist in securing the reports with permission to publish the indices. In order to facilitate preparation of the statistical analyses, it is requested that the completed questionnaires be submitted to the Washington Office by November 1. Final deadline is December 1.

associations, AAUP chapters and conferences, and individuals all over the country sent letters to responsible officials in Mississippi. Within the state there was little public reaction, but there was a quiet suggestion that Tougaloo students might begin transferring to state institutions. On March 31, the AAUP committee had its interview with the Lieutenant Governor, and in the next day's newspaper a columnist whose views are generally strong for segregation wrote,

One version is that nothing is likely to come of that proposed legislative investigation of Tougaloo College, because certain white educators frown on the idea.

They fear Mississippi's institutions of higher learning might lose their accreditation if the Legislature undertakes "political meddling" in Tougaloo's affairs.<sup>18</sup>

So far as members of the AAUP committee knew no one in a position to make such a threat had done so, but some of the letters to state officials had made much of the fact that Tougaloo was accredited by both the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and by the Mississippi Commission on College Accreditation.

In mid-April a new bill was introduced by Senators Dye and Yarbrough to amend the law governing the powers of the state accrediting commission. This bill was reported in news media as being aimed at Tougaloo. Its effect was to eliminate a former requirement that the state commission include on its list all institutions accredited by the Southern Association. The bill was approved on June 6, 1964, but no action has been taken to remove Tougaloo from the list of state-accredited institutions.

On the other side of the ledger, it was reported in May that a program had been agreed upon for cooperation between Tougaloo College and Brown University, with support from several foundations and at least one individual donor, for the purpose of improving educational opportunities for both students and faculty members at Tougaloo. Inasmuch as increased financial and other support, on a broad national basis, is precisely what the college needs, this program can be expected to strengthen its academic potential considerably.

### The Case of Professor James W. Silver

Although committee members have talked with Professor Silver, and with administrators and faculty members of Mississippi institutions of higher learning about Professor Silver, the following discussion is based largely on newspaper reports and documents in the public record. It is presented only partly with a view to explaining Professor Silver's relations to the University of Mississippi, the Board of Trustees, or the Legislature. It may be more valuable as a concrete and somewhat detailed demonstration of what happens when an un-

popular idea is promulgated to Mississippians in such a way that they cannot ignore it.

On November 7, 1963, Professor Silver, who was President of the Southern Historical Association that year, delivered the Presidential Address at the Association's meeting in Asheville, North Carolina. His topic was the "closed society" of Mississippi, which he said had developed, even before the Civil War, "an orthodoxy accepted by nearly everybody in the state." He described its character by saying that "The all-pervading doctrine then and now has been white supremacy, whether achieved through slavery or segregation, rationalized by a professed adherence to states' rights and bolstered by religious fundamentalism." And he said that "Today the totalitarian society of Mississippi imposes on all its people acceptance of and obedience to an official orthodoxy almost identical with the pro-slavery philosophy." The effect, he said, is that "In spite of what he claims, the white Mississippian is not even conservative, he is merely negative. He grows up being against most things other men at least have the pleasure of arguing about." And of the effect on the state he said that "In committing itself to the defense of the biracial system, Mississippi has erected a totalitarian society which to the present moment has eliminated the ordinary processes by which change is channeled. Through its police power coercion and force prevail, instead of accommodation, and the result is social paralysis. Thus, the Mississippian who prides himself on his individuality in reality lives in a climate where non-conformity is forbidden, where the white man is not free, where he does not dare to express a deviating opinion without looking over his shoulder."

A substantial part of the address was devoted to the recent history of the University of Mississippi, and particularly the crisis brought on by the court-ordered admission of James H. Meredith. Professor Silver's account of the riot was designed to correct certain misconceptions which had been propagated in Mississippi, particularly what he called the "palpable and cynical hoax. . . that the insurrection resulted from Federal encroachment, deliberately planned by the Kennedys and callously incited by McShane when he called for tear gas." Professor Silver stated that the news reports in the national media were "By and large . . . accurate and the interpretation sound and temperate." He placed the blame for the failure to prevent or control the riot very largely on Mississippi law enforcement officials. "From the arrival of the marshals at the Lyceum building shortly before 5 o'clock until the firing of the tear gas at 8, it became increasingly apparent that there was a serious lack of liaison between Federal and state officials on the scene. By 7 all observers knew that for whatever reason, the Mississippi Highway Patrol had abandoned its enforcement of law and order and was in fact in some cases encouraging the restless crowds to demonstrate against the marshals." Professor Silver also concluded that "The genesis of the deception which shifted the blame for the insurrection from Mississippians to Federal officials came from the university ad-

<sup>18</sup> Tom Ethridge, "Mississippi Notebook," *Jackson Clarion-Ledger*, April 1, 1964.

ministration. A singularly inaccurate story blaming the 'trigger-happy amateurish, incompetent' marshals, and suggesting examples of diabolical brutality toward male and female students, was in the hands of Barnett and Eastland within an hour or so of the firing of the gas."<sup>14</sup>

The immediate reaction to Professor Silver's address was that, instead of denying the general validity of its allegations, certain Mississippi officials rushed forward to prove that it contained at least some truth. Governor Barnett, interviewed in Athens, Georgia, where he had gone to make a speech, remarked that "Old Silver's liable to say anything. I wouldn't waste words on that man. He ought to have been kicked out a long time ago."<sup>15</sup> The next day the Vice President of the University of Mississippi student body accused Professor Silver of having "a closed mind" because he "believes that those who do not agree with him are ignorant."<sup>16</sup> The report of this comment in the Jackson *Clarion-Ledger* was prefaced by the remark, "Dr. Jim Silver, longtime history professor at Ole Miss, spoke in Asheville, N. C., Thursday night. Press wire reports he abused the state of Mississippi, its people, officials and newspapers in the same fashion he has in previous speeches in Atlanta, Memphis and other points."<sup>17</sup> A few days later U. S. Representative John Bell Williams, addressing the Mississippi L-P Gas Dealers Association, said that "accreditation or no accreditation the time has come to fumigate some of our college staffs and get those who will teach Americanism and not foreign ideologies." Obviously referring to Professor Silver though not by name. Representative Williams said "The time has come to call the bluff of anyone who cusses a state which has fed him for 28 years and get rid of him."<sup>18</sup> Representative Williams in turn was attacked by Claude Ramsey, President of the Mississippi AFL-CIO Labor Council, who said that "as the No. 1 product of the society described by Dr. Silver, the congressman evidently recognizes the truth when he sees it."<sup>19</sup> An editorial in Hazel Brannon Smith's Pulitzer Prize-winning *Northside Reporter*, published in Jackson, said that Silver had "spoken out in the interest of truth" and was "about to be crucified for it. All of which proves his major premise of the 'closed society in Mississippi' is true." Mississippians were urged to "read the speech and know what he really said before they send Silver to Siberia."<sup>20</sup> The Louis Liggetts Post of the American Legion, at its meeting on November 16, unanimously

<sup>14</sup> New York Times, Nov. 8, 1963, p. 19; James W. Silver, *Mississippi: The Closed Society*, New York, Harcourt, Brace & World, 1964, pp. 123-24. Professor Silver modifies his statement in a footnote to page 123.

<sup>15</sup> New Orleans States-Item, Nov. 8, 1963.

<sup>16</sup> Memphis Commercial Appeal, Nov. 9, 1963.

<sup>17</sup> Jackson Clarion-Ledger, Nov. 9, 1963.

<sup>18</sup> Memphis Commercial Appeal, Nov. 12, 1963, p. 1. The Jackson Clarion-Ledger and the AP wire service carried a variant version quoting Representative Williams as having said, "Silver has bitten the hand which has fed him for 28 years. It's time we call his bluff and get rid of him."

<sup>19</sup> Memphis Commercial Appeal, Nov. 13, 1963.

<sup>20</sup> Northside Reporter, Nov. 14, 1963. The offices of this paper were bombed on the night of August 27, 1964.

adopted a resolution asking the Board of Trustees to dismiss Professor Silver."<sup>21</sup> Other comment by columnists and writers of letters to editors continued for several days, culminating in the suggestion by Tom Ethridge that "There is reason to believe that attorneys for our State Highway Patrol may be contemplating legal action as a result of serious charges made against the Patrol by Dr. James W. Silver."<sup>22</sup> However, no official action was taken against Professor Silver at that time.

On March 14, 1964, Professor Silver is reported to have predicted that when young people came into Mississippi from other parts of the country in the summer "They are going to clash with deputy sheriffs" and to have added, "I rather suspect there's going to be somebody killed."<sup>23</sup> Five days later Senator Corbit L. Patridge attacked Professor Silver on the floor of the Senate, saying "He is opposed to everything we stand for in this state. . . . I am outraged that the taxpayers have to pay the salary of a man like this. I can't see why the legislature will tolerate such an idiot to teach in this state. The responsibility of getting rid of this man rests on our shoulders. When a professor says that anyone, white or colored, is going to get killed—and sanctions it—it is time to get rid of him." Senator Patridge followed up with another speech on March 27, in which he said, "We sit complacently by and let a person tread the length and breadth of our great nation deceitfully and cowardly expanding the subject of racial hate, calling our people backward, ignorant and with a closed society. . . . I call on this body today to direct the chancellor at the University of Mississippi, along with the board of trustees, to drastically reduce the salary and duties of Dr. Silver and to stifle his degrading activities. . . . If the chancellor and the board do not act in relation to Dr. Silver, then I say let us, the members of the legislature, assume the responsibility that we asked the people to place in our hands and do the job—and do it well." Evidently Senator Patridge had had some second thoughts—but not such as to change his general view—for he went on to remark, "I have been told that this is exactly what Dr. Silver wants us to do. If we fire him, he will get national fame. I say then, it is better that he get national fame than for us to receive racial death."

Meanwhile, on March 23, Representative Malcolm Mabry told the House of Representatives that "the time has come for the people of this state to rise in righteous indignation and demand of the board of trustees and for the University of Mississippi chancellor that this so-called professor be dismissed. . . . I for one—as a legislator, as an alumnus of Ole Miss and as a Mississippian—am ready to join in any effort, short of violence of course, to help rid the university and the state of such a character as James Wesley Silver." Noting that enrollment at the University of Mississippi had dropped approximately ten per cent, Representative Ma-

<sup>21</sup> Memphis Commercial Appeal, Nov. 16, 1963, p. 18.

<sup>22</sup> "Mississippi Notebook," Jackson Clarion-Ledger, Nov. 20, 1963, p. 12.

<sup>23</sup> Jackson Daily News, March 14, 1964.

bry prophesied that "Dr. Silver's damnable distortions of the truth and half-truths are going to cause other parents all over this state to refuse to send their sons and daughters to this institution. Ole Miss—a great institution—can't afford another 10 per cent drop next year. Silver does us nothing but harm and we are paying for it."<sup>24</sup>

On April 5 an anonymous commentator reported "Reliable sources" as saying that "His opponents feel they are on the verge of finding a way to ease Dr. Silver out which would not affect the university's accreditation since the action would not be taken on political grounds."<sup>25</sup> On April 16 a subcommittee of the Board of Trustees was scheduled to submit a report on Professor Silver to the whole Board, and a wire service report dated April 15 quoted a Board member as saying, "Nobody can accuse the board of moving because of legislative pressure. We have proven we can withstand that kind of pressure."<sup>26</sup> On April 15 Representative Jim Mathis introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives calling on the Board of Trustees to investigate "employees whose public utterances, speeches, writings or other contumacious conduct or activity may be in violation of . . . the constitution of the state or any other standards of ethical conduct. . . ."<sup>27</sup> On April 16 the AAUP chapter at the University of Mississippi sent a telegram to the Board of Trustees to "reiterate its concern about the maintenance of academic freedom on the campus of the university" and to remind the Board that "Sanctions by accrediting and other agencies can lead to a weakening of faculty morale, a difficulty in the recruitment of new faculty members of high calibre, a general decline in the quality of the faculty, and loss of standing in the academic community. . . ." On April 19, Leroy Collins, President of the National Broadcasters Association and former Governor of Florida, speaking to Louisiana and Mississippi broadcasters in Biloxi, Mississippi, urged them to oppose the ouster of Professor Silver on grounds of his freedom of speech.<sup>28</sup>

The Jackson *Daily News* reported on April 20 that the Board had taken no action on the subcommittee report, but that the Board's Executive Secretary, Dr. Jobe, had said the investigation would be continued. The UPI wire service carried substantially the same report under the date of April 23.<sup>29</sup> The wire service report added that "Reliable sources said the board plans to turn the matter over to the University of Mississippi for consideration by a faculty committee. This is the

<sup>24</sup> *Southern School News*, April, 1964, p. 14. This article also reports an attack by Senator W. M. Jones on Professor Russell Barrett of the University of Mississippi for a speech Professor Barrett made at the inaugural meeting of the AAUP chapter at the University of Mississippi School of Medicine in Jackson on March 17.

<sup>25</sup> *Memphis Commercial Appeal*, April 5, 1964, p. 14.

<sup>26</sup> *Memphis Commercial Appeal*, April 16, 1964, p. 56.

<sup>27</sup> *Jackson Clarion-Ledger*, April 16, 1964.

<sup>28</sup> *Memphis Commercial Appeal*, April 19, 1964, Sec. 1, p. 10; and *Washington Post*, April 22, 1964.

<sup>29</sup> *Jackson Daily News*, April 20, 1964; and *Memphis Commercial Appeal*, April 24, 1964.

usual procedure in handling dismissals." This prediction was also made in a letter from Dr. Jobe to the chairman of the AAUP committee, dated April 17. Dr. Jobe's letter also stated that the reason no action was taken at the April 16 meeting of the Board was that "the committee decided to arrange a conference with Professor Silver before completing its report."

As a basis for this conference, a letter, signed by Dr. Jobe and dated April 27, was sent to Professor Silver, requesting that he appear before the Board subcommittee. Professor Silver had already appeared informally before the subcommittee on the fourteenth and had been questioned at considerable length. Professor Silver was informed that at the new meeting "you will be requested to state under oath before a stenographer or reporter such comments and responses as you may care to make concerning the following specific matters and any similar or related matters, together with any other or additional comments or remarks you may wish to have become a part of the Subcommittee's investigation report to the Board of Trustees concerning your fitness as a member of the faculty of the University of Mississippi. Should it be your desire, you may have counselors or attorneys with you at the time of your appearance." He was also told that "A copy of the report of all remarks at this appearance will be made available for your inspection as promptly as possible."

Fifteen "specific matters which will be inquired about" were listed. Nine had to do with statements which Professor Silver was alleged to have made in his speech at the Southern Historical Society meeting and on four other occasions, one in Denver the day after that meeting, one in Memphis on October 5, 1963, and two in Atlanta, the first on August 1, 1963, and the second on January 16, 1964. These topics all followed the same format: "The basis for your alleged statement . . . and any action taken by you related to such statement since it was issued including but not limited to its reissuance, modification or retraction." The following statements were cited:

1. The genesis of the deception which shifted the blame for the insurrection from Mississippians to federal officials came from the University administration. A singularly inaccurate story blaming the "trigger-happy, amateurish, incompetent" marshals, and suggesting examples of diabolical brutality toward male and female students, was in the hands of Barnett and Eastland within an hour or so of the firing of the gas.

2. Long after it was made abundantly clear that many faculty members had witnessed the inception of the riot and knew for a certainty about the fraud against the federal government, the administration did not deviate from its original position but, on the contrary, continued to search for evidence condemning the marshals.

3. By seven all observers knew that for whatever reason, the Mississippi Highway Patrol had abandoned its enforcement of law and was in fact in some cases

encouraging the restless crowd to demonstrate against the marshals.

4. That the witnesses who testified before the Legislative Investigating Committee of the Mississippi Legislature "would have small compunction about lying to a legislative investigating committee, especially one that made perfectly clear what it wanted to hear."

5. The people of Mississippi have thus once again been victimized, this time by a gigantic hoax perpetrated on them by their own time-serving leaders whose sense of loyalty is only to the false orthodoxy of the closed society.

6. Ole Miss officials admitted that they lied about the riot in an effort to protect themselves and the school.

7. Ole Miss at best has but a mediocre faculty. Nobody in his right mind would go to Ole Miss for an education in the first place. In all fairness to Chancellor Williams, I must admit that he has occasional good days. We are faced with at least ten years of extreme mediocrity at Ole Miss, all of which could have been avoided by able administrative leadership.

8. The search for historical truth . . . has become a casualty in embattled Mississippi.

9. The ultimate result will be violence which will last a long time. I would almost predict Federal occupation. I think we're in, in the next three or four years, for a holocaust. I rather suspect there's going to be somebody killed.

The remaining six items were the following:

10. The amount of time which your public speaking engagements have required, including preparation and travel. The dates and places you have made public appearances outside the State of Mississippi in the past six months. The amount of time spent in teaching, consulting with students, graduate students and fellow faculty members about subjects you are teaching and research in your current teaching field.

11. The number of doctoral dissertations you have counseled or advised. Your support or opposition to a doctoral program in your department. Your endeavors in recruiting new doctoral candidates, students and faculty members.

12. Your activities on September 30 and October 1, 1962.

13. Any published writings or public speeches by you relating to the University, its administration or faculty during the past 6 months.

14. Any and all records or appearances before or written reports or complaints to committees of the University faculty or members of the University administration concerning your duties as a faculty member or the condition or conduct of the University.

15. Such other matters as your comments or responses may disclose would warrant further information or inquiry.

This "appearance" was set up in such a way that it manifestly lacked most of the fundamental elements of due process considered essential to a dismissal hearing, and it seems clear that the Board did not consider that it would be a dismissal hearing. Nevertheless it was equally clear that it was intended as part of a procedure that might, if specific charges were developed that would warrant such a hearing, in fact lead to Professor Silver's dismissal for cause. The requirement of testimony under oath and the provision of a written record could only have been designed to generate evidence that might be used against Professor Silver in such a hearing. The most serious deficiency in the procedure was the fact that it was initiated by the Board of Trustees, rather than by the campus administration of the University of Mississippi. It is universally recognized that in all such cases the Board of Trustees is the institution's last reviewing authority. If the Board, in fact or in effect, initiates charges that may lead to a faculty member's dismissal, it places itself in the position of reviewing its own actions, of deciding whether or not its own allegations are true. The element of prejudice in such a proceeding would seem to be obvious; the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* and the 1958 *Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings* clearly spell out the proper courses of action; and the experience of the AAUP and the academic profession generally demonstrates, in a large number of recorded cases, that boards of trustees do not in fact proceed objectively after having initiated charges, whether formally or under the guise of a preliminary investigation or inquiry. It is hard to see why a board would begin such a proceeding unless it intended to arrive at a judgment of dismissal. The only safe assumption, therefore, is that any case which is initiated by a board of trustees will almost certainly be prejudiced from that point on.

These considerations were brought to the attention of the Board in two letters from the Washington Office of AAUP, dated April 28 and May 11. Whether or not they had an effect on the Board's deliberations is not known to us.

In the broader context, the accompaniment of these proceedings by the drumfire of attacks on Professor Silver by the Governor, the Congressman, and the state Senator and Representative, together with politically oriented elements of the major news media, unavoidably raises the question of political interference with the supposedly independent operation of the Board of Trustees. This question is put with particular force by Senator Patridge's recommendation that "If the chancellor and the board do not act in relation to Dr. Silver, then I say let us, the members of the legislature, assume the responsibility . . . and do the job—and do it well." The fact that this call was issued less than a month before the date of the Board's letter to Professor Silver must have the effect of placing the Board in an extremely embarrassing situation if it wishes to press the case, because the only way it could conclusively prove its political independence would be by refusing to dis-

miss Professor Silver and letting the Legislature, if it be so minded, go ahead and pass Senator Patridge's suggested bill of attainder.

All of these questions now appear to have been suspended or postponed. At its meeting of June 18, 1964, the Board of Trustees took the following action:

*Dr. James W. Silver*, Professor of History, was granted an academic leave of absence from the above position . . . leave being without pay for the period beginning September 1, 1964, and ending June 6, 1965, for the purpose of serving as Visiting Professor of History at the University of Notre Dame for the 1964-65 session.

Further, on recommendation of the Special Investigating Committee, the Board resolved that,

Without waiving any charge of contumacious conduct against Dr. James W. Silver under investigation by the Board and with full reservation of all rights, duties and obligations of the Board in connection therewith and with understanding that the Board and its Committee are charged with responsibility to continue their investigation now in progress with the foregoing condition, the recommendation of the Chancellor to grant Dr. James W. Silver a leave of absence without pay for the school year of 1964-65 be approved.

Professor Silver had applied for the leave because, having received an invitation to serve as visiting professor at Notre Dame, he judged that he would have made such an application if he had not been the subject of a Board of Trustees proceeding. Since granting this leave of absence, the Board has taken no further action with regard to Professor Silver.

#### **By Way of Conclusion: Some General Observations**

In a study of this kind there can be no real conclusion. The committee can say only that this report is as accurate a reflection as it was possible to make of conditions of academic freedom in Mississippi, mainly as they appeared in the winter and spring of 1963-1964. The actual situation was and is and will continue to be vastly more complex than any picture the committee could draw. Many people, with widely differing abilities and temperaments, are involved in it; for each of these people it is a somewhat different situation than it is for any of the others. Moreover, the whole situation, particularly in those aspects which have to do with the segregation problem, is in a process of complex and very rapid change. Segregation itself is crumbling at every point. In February, 1965, Millsaps College voluntarily adopted an unsegregated admissions policy, and several Negro students have been admitted. Three public school systems have been desegregated by court order and without violence; two of these, Jackson and Biloxi, are among the largest in the State. The full impact of

the new Civil Rights Law has yet to be measured; but it has already resulted in desegregation of public accommodations in places that were until recently regarded as the last bulwarks of the Southern (segregated) way of life. Registration of Negroes to vote has not made a great deal of progress yet, but it has made some, and the foundations for a greater increase have been established. The Mississippi Summer Project, sponsored by the Council of Federated Organizations (COFO), has had some success, along with a great deal of opposition and frustration. The murder of three of its workers shocked the nation, the world, and a great many people in Mississippi. Growing numbers of responsible people, chiefly business men, have been coming forward in various parts of the state with public appeals for enforcement of law and order, for keeping the public schools open, and for peaceful compliance with federal laws, including the public accommodations section of the Civil Rights Act.

There is also, of course, as everyone expected, a very strong "backlash" against the changes that are moving Mississippi so rapidly in the direction of desegregation, and the state has been in a whirlwind of political turmoil internally as well as in its relations with the national government. The politicians, who have to count votes rather than dollars, occupy a very uncomfortable position between the pressures of the apparently large majority of white citizens in Mississippi who feel that segregation must be preserved as much and as long as possible and, on the other hand, the increasingly active and determined minority within the state and the apparently fairly large majority in the nation as a whole of people who are determined to do away with segregation as quickly as possible.

Governor Johnson's relatively enlightened inaugural address was preceded by a political campaign in which candidate Johnson deliberately and successfully set out to shout louder for segregation than anyone else, and to make every bit of local political capital he could out of the fact that he had on one occasion physically prevented James Meredith's entrance into the University; and it has been followed by a good many obstructionist statements along the same line, which have been sharply out of tune with the Governor's very laudable and for the most part remarkably successful efforts to preserve law and order. There have been no major race riots in Mississippi since his election. But the political turmoil continues in strange, bizarre, and destructive ways. The Mississippi delegation withdrew almost unanimously from the national Democratic convention, the state voted 87% for Goldwater in the election, and the only Republican who ran for Congress was elected by a large majority. When the Congress met, Representative John Bell Williams, a self-styled "Mississippi Democrat" who had publicly endorsed the Republican candidate for the presidency, was deprived of his seniority on the House committees of which he was a member. The state is on trial literally as well as figuratively in a number of court cases involving civil rights charges, and it is



under pressure to desegregate all facilities supported by federal money, or lose the money. Redoubled efforts to attract new industries are apparently running into more than redoubled sales resistance on the part of potential investors.

In this atmosphere of intensely conflicting feelings, arising out of the encounter between a rapidly changing social situation and an almost pathological xenophobia concerning ideas which are believed to be subversive of the traditional way of life, conditions of academic freedom are precarious, and are likely to continue so for a time. How much, if any, they can be expected to improve in the very near future is anybody's guess; the guess of the AAUP committee is that in the long run at least they probably will improve, if only because of the necessity imposed by Mississippi's ambitious attempt at economic development, which will require expanded programs in all aspects of education, and especially in research.

Meanwhile, the defense of the academic freedom that now exists in Mississippi, and the careful and patient work that must be done to increase and improve it, will require the best, the most thoughtful, and the most diplomatic efforts of everyone concerned, both within the state and in any other places where there are links of relationship with the situation, or where such links can be established. In recent crises much good has been done by regional and national academic organizations and by faculty members in all parts of the country, with the aid of some rather expert tightrope walking on the part of Mississippi administrators and responsible public

officials. With further exertion of these cooperative efforts, there is reason to hope and expect that academic freedom in Mississippi will not merely endure but that it will prevail.

Richard P. Adams (English), Tulane University,  
*Chairman*

Frances C. Brown (Chemistry), Duke University  
Gladys Kammerer (Political Science), University of  
Florida

Forrest W. Lacey (Law), University of Tennessee

*The Special Committee*

Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure has by vote authorized publication of this report in the *AAUP Bulletin*:

Clark Byse (Law) Harvard University, *Chairman*  
*Members:* Richard P. Adams (English), Tulane University; William O. Aydelotte (History), University of Iowa; Frances C. Brown (Chemistry), Duke University; Bertram H. Davis (English), Washington Office; David Fellman (Political Science), University of Wisconsin, *ex officio*; William P. Fidler (English), Washington Office, *ex officio*; Ralph F. Fuchs (Law), Indiana University; C. William Heywood (History), Cornell College; Sanford H. Kadish (Law), University of California, Berkeley; Walter P. Metzger (History), Columbia University; Paul Oberst (Law), University of Kentucky; John P. Roche (Political Science), Brandeis University; Warren Taylor (English), Oberlin College.