American Educational Research Journal
Winter 1999, Vol. 36, No. 4, pp. 739–758

Scylla and Charybdis: Navigating the Waters of Academic Freedom at Fisk University During Charles S. Johnson's Administration (1946–1956)

Marybeth Gasman
Indiana University

A prominent sociologist and race relations activist, Charles S. Johnson dedicated his life to the advancement of Blacks. His presidency at Fisk University, a historically Black college, was the culmination of his career. During the latter part of his administration, he faced a dilemma involving an outspoken professor named Lee Lorch, who, in 1954, was accused of being a communist. Johnson and the Board of Trustees dismissed Lorch because he refused to answer a congressional committee's questions about his previous political affiliations. In 1959, the American Association of University Professors found the late President Johnson guilty of violating the principles of academic freedom. This article explores the ways in which academic freedom, civil liberties, and civil rights clashed in the Lee Lorch case. Furthermore, it examines the ways in which the setting of a historically Black college alters traditional assumptions about the application of these principles.

MARYBETH GASMAN recently completed her PhD in higher education at Indiana University. She has accepted a position as Assistant Professor of Higher Education, Georgia State University, Atlanta, effective fall 2000. She can be reached at 138 Perry Ct., #2, San Antonio, TX 78209. Her specializations are Black higher education, philanthropy, and Black leadership.

In a decision overturning an Oklahoma law requiring instructors to swear that they were not members of a subversive or communist organization, Justice Felix Frankfurter wrote:

> [Instructors] . . . must be exemplars of open-mindedness and free inquiry. They cannot carry out their noble task if the conditions for the practice of a responsible and critical mind [are] denied to them. They must have the freedom of responsible inquiry . . . into the meaning of social and economic ideas, into the checkered history of social and economic dogma.[1]

In Frankfurter's mind, "open-mindedness and free inquiry" included the right to free association. This decision in *Wieman v. Updegraff* was one of many in which the courts upheld the rights of academic freedom both inside and out of the classroom.

During the McCarthy era, there were many instances in which academic freedom, particularly the extent of faculty members' rights to express themselves outside of the classroom, was challenged. Charles S. Johnson's presidency at Fisk University, and more specifically a controversy involving Professor Lee Lorch, provides an example of the collision of academic freedom with civil rights and the cause of Black higher education. Not unlike most college and university presidents, Johnson had many difficult decisions to make during his tenure at Fisk University. He was forced to balance the opinions of his constituents (i.e., faculty, staff, trustees, donors, alumni, students, and local Nashville citizens) with his own convictions and agenda. Like his counterparts at predominantly White institutions, Johnson faced the pressure of meeting donor expectations that accompanied monetary contributions.

However, in addition to these pressures, Johnson was confronting issues that weighed heavily on the shoulders of historically Black college and university (HBCU) presidents. Johnson had to contend with the race-laden political agendas of donors and southern Whites who feared that the equal education of Blacks would lead to demands for equality in other areas. Above all, Johnson's presidency took place at what may have been the most important turning point in the history of Black civil rights during the 20th century: the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision.[2] The uncertainty surrounding this decision created a need for Johnson to weigh his actions carefully in terms of their effects on the future of race relations in the South. It was in this context that Johnson was handed the dilemma of dismissing one of his faculty members, Lee Lorch, or putting the future of Fisk in jeopardy. In making a decision, Johnson stayed close to his overall pragmatic philosophy, which he best expressed in a 1942 interview with the *Chicago Defender*:

> The difference between random behavior and a program is largely that of the ends in view. The thing that gives meaning to any single act is the larger context in which it is set. No strategy is sound that does not envisage the total picture in such a way that a person can be helped in deciding, in smaller individual cases, what is soundest and most important to stress and what, on the whole, is of minor consequences.[3]

Charles S. Johnson's interaction with Lee Lorch pitted this pragmatic philosophy against that of an outspoken activist. This article explores the ways in which academic freedom, civil liberties, and civil rights clashed in the Lorch case. Furthermore, it examines the ways in which the setting of a historically Black college alters traditional assumptions about the application of these principles.

Academic Freedom at Fisk: A Checkered Past

Questions of academic freedom at Fisk are not unique to Charles S. Johnson's presidency. Throughout the university's history, Fisk presidents battled with these issues. Established in 1866 through a joint effort by the government's Freedmen's Bureau and the American Missionary Association, Fisk University gave educational opportunity to the former slaves. Under its first president, Erastus Milo Cravath, Fisk received the majority of its funding from local and national grassroots missionary organizations. Because of this support, the institution was able to develop a rigorous liberal-arts-based curriculum while maintaining independence from the local southern White political structure.

As operating costs increased and missionary funds dried up, later Fisk presidents had to look for alternative funding sources. It was at this point that several White northern industrialists, who had previously supported only primary and secondary education for Blacks, began to support Black colleges. The motivation behind the shift in interest was most likely a desire by the industrial philanthropists to control all forms of Black education. In contrast to a liberal arts curriculum that encouraged political and social advancement, the philanthropists advocated industrial education that provided Blacks with skills appropriate for menial positions only. Rather than learning about literature, philosophy, and science, Blacks were trained in household duties, planting, field work, personal hygiene, and horse shoeing.[4]

During the same time period, the General Education Board (GEB) was established by John D. Rockefeller. The board was a conglomeration of major industrial philanthropists and some lesser known but influential individuals. Because of the tremendous financial backing and the influence of its members, the GEB gained a virtual monopoly on education and philanthropy for southern Blacks. The GEB was primarily concerned with the prosperity of the South's agricultural economy and the role of Blacks in this prosperity. It wanted to provide Blacks with skills, morals, and enough education to keep them in the South as the laboring class.[5]

The motives of the GEB and other industrial philanthropists have been characterized by some historians as benevolent and by others as self-serving and reactionary. Christopher Jencks and David Reisman, as well as Merle Curti and Roderick Nash, depict the northern philanthropists as pragmatic contributors who supported Black education for genuinely philanthropic reasons. These historians generally accepted the northern industrialists' own explanation for their support of industrial education: that support of anything more forward would have "incurred White supremacist vengeance." Raymond Fosdick, a member of the GEB, offered this type of apology in 1962 when he wrote:

> The Board was aware from the start of the dangers inherent in a Northern institution working in the highly charged emotional atmosphere of a biracial South. . . . A single misstep could be disastrous . . . consequently its role was marked with caution and modesty. . . . That the philosophy of [Wallace] Buttrick [former head of the General Education Board] and his contemporaries was based on the idea of gradualism cannot be denied. But his was the thinking of the time. . . . Their strategy was strongly pragmatic. To raise the level of education in the South . . . it was necessary to work through the race in power. Sixty years ago there was no alternative to this approach; there was no public opinion to support any other cause.[6]

In contrast, Edward Berman and several other historians note that the industrialists wanted to focus their resources on a small group of "safe" southern Blacks in order to perpetuate an educational structure that repressed the social and economic advancement of all but a selected few. The GEB's use of its financial resources to gain power over institutions parallels Rockefeller's monopolistic business strategies in his other enterprises.[7]

The first of the Fisk presidents to accept contributions from industrial philanthropists was James Merrill. The GEB contributed to the establishment of an applied sciences program at Fisk. Upon receiving the financial support, President Merrill said:

> It must not be understood in the least that I decry industrial training; on the other hand, as a source of mental development it is of great value to the college student, and I hope the day is not far away when, for this reason if for no other, Fisk can have a well-equipped industrial department. The two types of education [liberal arts and industrial] are not antagonistic and can be made so only as those who are at the head of the different schools lack breadth of view.[8]

Under President Merrill's leadership, Fisk University's curriculum continued to shift toward industrial education. In addition to his cooperation with the GEB, Merrill asked Booker T. Washington, the chief Black promoter of industrial education, for his support in raising funds for Fisk. A product of the Hampton Institute, Washington advocated educating students to meet the present-day conditions in the South. He stressed the dignity and beauty of labor to students: "to send every graduate out feeling and knowing that labor is dignified and beautiful—to make each one love labor instead of trying to escape it." This shift and the narrowing of academic freedom that accompanied it caught the attention of Fisk's most prominent alumnus and staunch advocate of liberal arts, W. E. B. Du Bois. He thought that only liberal arts education would provide Blacks with the resources to obtain intellectual, social, and political equality. When asked to deliver the Fisk graduation address in 1908, Du Bois took the opportunity to rebuke the university's administration:

> And so today this venerable institution stands before its problem of future development, with the bribe of Public Opinion and Private Wealth dangling before us, if we will either deny that our object is the highest and

> broadest training of black Men, or if we will consent to call Higher Education that which you know and I know is not Higher Education. And I say we in this case advisedly; for my brothers and sisters, if this happens: if the ideal is lowered or the lie told, the responsibility rests on us.

According to Du Bois, it was this speech that led to President Merrill's resignation and the demise of the Department of Applied Sciences. In his own explanation, Merrill essentially acknowledged the issues that Du Bois had raised, although he did not admit that it was Du Bois in particular who caused him to resign. Upon his departure, he told the Board of Trustees, "The only real difficulty is the money side and this difficulty is so great that I have come to the conclusion that I have no longer a right to continue in my present position."[9]

Perhaps the most serious attempt to alter the curriculum at Fisk was during Fayette McKenzie's reign. In his inaugural address in 1915, he assured the White southerners and northern philanthropists that Fisk would aid in restoring the South to economic prosperity and increase the wealth of the nation—precisely the goals of these groups. Satisfied with McKenzie's leadership, the GEB agreed, in 1920, to support a campaign to raise a $1 million endowment for Fisk. With such large sums of money pledged to Fisk, the philanthropists were easily able to take control of its board of trustees from the former alliance of Black educators and White missionaries.[10]

In 1923, a General Education Board memorandum called for the collection of more financial support for Fisk and emphasized the urgent need to train "the right type of colored leaders"—leaders who would assist the Negro in becoming a capable worker and a respectable citizen. Following up on this memo, McKenzie curtailed the liberal arts curriculum, suspended the student newspaper, and refused to allow a campus charter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). Furthermore, he arranged special Jim Crow entertainment for the White benefactors of the university. Clearly, the "right type of colored leader" was one who would acquiesce in the segregationist social order in the South. As a result of his suppression of student initiative and narrowing of the curriculum, McKenzie was able to gain not only the support of the industrial philanthropists but the praise of the local southern White population. In what was perhaps the first instance of a southern city supporting Black higher education, the White citizens organized a campaign to raise $50,000 for the university.[11]

McKenzie's high-handed tactics were a clear violation of the accepted principles of academic freedom. While the definition of academic freedom was and continues to be fluid, it had, in McKenzie's time, come to focus on two German concepts: *Lehrfreiheit* and *Lernfreiheit*. Roughly, *Lehrfreiheit* was the professor's right to research and teach what he or she pleased; *Lernfreiheit* was the student's right to study what he or she pleased. Of the two concepts, *Lehrfreiheit* was adopted wholeheartedly by the American academic community. For example, the 1915 American Association of University Professors (AAUP) statement on academic freedom set forth guidelines to ensure that the college professor would have both freedom within the classroom and freedom to research and publish on the subjects of his or her choice—roughly the same as the German concept

of *Lehrfreiheit*. By curtailing the curriculum, McKenzie clearly violated the AAUP's interpretation of the German concepts.[12]

McKenzie's repression of students and pandering to the southern Whites caused unrest and alienation among many of the Fisk alumni and students. Alumni contributions were at an all-time low during McKenzie's presidency. The feelings of disgruntled alumni and students spread rapidly across the country and eventually caught the attention of W. E. B. Du Bois. When invited to give the commencement address at Fisk in 1924, Du Bois openly criticized the Fisk administration:

> I have come to address you and, I say frankly, I have come to criticize. . . . I come to defend two theses, and the first is this: Of all the essentials that make an institution of learning, money is the least. The second is this: The alumni of Fisk University are and of right ought to be, the ultimate source of authority in the policy and government of this institution. . . . Fisk University is not taking an honest position with regard to the Southern situation. It has deliberately embraced a propaganda which discredits all of the hard work which the forward looking fighters for Negro freedom have been doing. . . . It continually teaches its students and constituency that this liberal white South is in the ascendancy and that it is ruling; and that the only thing required of the black man is acquiescence and submission.[13]

During the months following Du Bois's speech, alumni and student anger escalated against the university's policies and conduct. In January of 1925, alumni groups from all over the United States met in New York City for the sole purpose of agitating for McKenzie's resignation. On February 4, 1925, the Fisk students revolted. In a protest the day after the student revolt, more than 2,500 Black Nashville citizens called for McKenzie's ouster. Several historians believe this was a major factor in McKenzie's resignation 3 months later. After the revolt, Fisk encountered much difficulty in securing funds. Philanthropists were reluctant to give money to an unstable university, and the White citizens of Nashville withdrew their support. In contrast, Hampton University, which maintained its industrial curriculum, was able to amass an $8.5 million endowment during this period. The conflict during McKenzie's presidency left a permanent mark on the history of Fisk.[14]

The Rise of Black Leadership at Fisk

In 1946, Charles S. Johnson was selected as Fisk's sixth president and its first Black president. With years of research and teaching experience as well as excellent connections with philanthropic organizations, Johnson came well prepared. He was born into a religious, middle-class family in Bristol, Virginia. Heavily influenced by his father, an educated Baptist minister, Johnson had aspirations of attending college at a young age. He graduated with an AB from Virginia Union College in 1916. With Chicago sociologist Robert E. Park as his mentor, Johnson earned a PhB from the University of Chicago in 1917. During

World War I, Johnson interrupted his studies at the University of Chicago to enlist in the military. Upon returning to Chicago in 1919, he found himself in the midst of a city torn by race rioting. The stoning of Eugene Williams—a young Black man who accidentally swam into the "White side" of a Chicago beach—spurred one of the country's worst race riots. This incident sparked Johnson's involvement with the Chicago Race Relations Commission as associate executive secretary. In 1922, Johnson and the Chicago commission published *The Negro in Chicago: A Study of Race Relations and a Race Riot.* He received national acclaim for his involvement with the study and the commission.[15]

In 1921, he moved to New York to work as the director of the department of research and investigations at the National Urban League. In addition, Johnson edited *Opportunity: A Journal of Negro Life* during his 7-year stay in New York. Many credit this publication with the spawning of the Harlem Renaissance.[16]

Near the close of the Harlem Renaissance in 1928, Charles Johnson returned to the South to establish a nationally known department of social science and an internationally known race relations institute at Fisk University. In addition to his work on race relations within the academic setting, Johnson served as a trustee for the Julius Rosenwald Fund from 1934 to 1948, working specifically as the co-director of the race relations program. From 1944 to 1950, he served as the director of the race relations division of the American Missionary Association. During his career, Johnson also conducted research for the government and worked as a cultural ambassador under Presidents Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower.

Despite his strong interest in race relations, Charles Johnson was not an activist in the tradition of W. E. B. Du Bois, Martin Luther King, Jr., Marcus Garvy, or Paul Robeson. A self-proclaimed "sidelines activist," Johnson advocated a well-thought-out, research-based approach to advancing the rights of Blacks. Methodical research, in his opinion, was "a necessary prelude to liberal reform and change in public policy." As evidenced by the many books and articles he published—notably *Into the Mainstream: A Survey of Best Practices in Race Relations in the South, Shadow of the Plantation,* and *Race Relations: Adjustment of Whites and Negroes in the United States*—Johnson had very specific ideas about race relations. He thought that "social science could be joined to advocacy—in various degrees of militancy—in the sense that a solid foundation of research would serve the advocates [he among them] in demonstrating the depth and scope of racial inequality preventing millions of African Americans from achieving 'full American citizenship.' "[17]

Charles Johnson spent a lifetime working toward Black equality, with his most valuable contribution being his creation of venues for dialogue, self-expression, and change. Whether he was publishing artistic works in *Opportunity,* helping an emerging scholar obtain a Rosenwald Fellowship, or giving a very young Martin Luther King, Jr., an opportunity to speak at the renowned Fisk race relations institutes, Johnson made significant contributions to the advancement of Blacks in the United States.

While Johnson admitted to being a "sidelines activist," he fought on many occasions for the exchange of diverse ideas and freedom within the academy.

For example, during the summer of 1944, when Johnson began holding the race relations institutes, he received extensive criticism from the local press. Fisk was chastised for its mixed-race conference sleeping facilities, interracial dancing and dining, and, in particular, the discussion of "radical" ideas. The White citizens of Nashville threatened to censor the institute, and then-President Thomas Elsa Jones intended to accede to their wishes. In response, Johnson threatened to leave Fisk and invited his colleagues in the social science department to go with him. Eventually, Jones conceded to Johnson and left the race relations institute intact. Johnson's insistence on open discussion at the race relations institute clearly falls within *Lehrfreiheit*—the right of the professor to teach. The radical ideas discussed (integration, voting rights, and socioeconomic advancement for Blacks) were part of Johnson's research, and surely he had a right to teach them.[18]

While *Lehrfreiheit* was generally accepted as a core principle of academic freedom, there was much controversy over whether it should apply outside of the classroom and outside of the professor's discipline. Should a professor's controversial statements and affiliations with so-called radical groups be protected under academic freedom, even if they put the institution in jeopardy? Should a professor be free to make pronouncements on topics beyond the scope of his or her expertise? In its 1940 statement of principles, the AAUP clearly favored an expansion of academic freedom to include broad-based civil liberties as well as the right of the professor to research and lecture freely within his or her field: "When he [i.e., the college or university teacher] speaks or writes as a citizen he should be free from institutional censorship or discipline." The AAUP's statement implies that professors merit the same freedoms within the institution as do citizens of the United States under the Constitution.[19]

Although his involvement in the race relations institutes showed Johnson to be a staunch defender of civil rights, his advocacy of civil liberties is a more complex issue. In some instances, he clearly defended the right to free speech and association. In 1948, for example, he was called before the Tenney Committee (Joint Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities, State Senate of California) as a result of his affiliation with the National Sharecroppers Fund. In a strong defense of civil liberties, Johnson denounced the committee's inquiries as "witch-hunts" and stated that they were "much more un-American than the un-American activities being pursued." In 1949, when called to testify on the alleged communist infiltration of HBCUs, Johnson assured the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) that there was no evidence to substantiate this claim.[20]

However, in other cases, particularly those dealing with internal university affairs, Johnson's defense of civil liberties was less clear. In 1949, Fisk physics professor Giovanni "Ross" Lomanitz took the Fifth Amendment when called to testify about his alleged communist affiliation. Lomanitz was cited for contempt of Congress. Shortly afterward, President Johnson informed Lomanitz, who was untenured, that his contempt charges made it impossible for Fisk to offer him another year of work under contract. Although offered the opportunity to work without a contract, Lomanitz refused and left Fisk. Johnson had been "officially"

in the Fisk presidency only 2 years when the Lomanitz controversy came across his desk. Coupled with the pressure of being the first Black president of Fisk, his newness in the role may have had an impact on his decision. The Lomanitz situation was not the kind of publicity that Johnson wanted as he was attempting to build the university's endowment, attract top-rate scholars, and move Fisk into the mainstream of American higher education.[21]

Again in 1951, Johnson was faced with a question of defending civil liberties or remaining silent when W. E. B. Du Bois was indicted on the flimsy charge of failing to register as an agent of a foreign power. Although offering support to Du Bois may have seemed logical on the part of HBCU presidents, only Charles Johnson spoke out on his behalf. According to Du Bois, "Of the 50 presidents of Negro colleges, every one of which I had known and visited—of these only one, Charles Johnson of Fisk University, publicly professed belief in my integrity before the trial; and only one congratulated me after the acquittal." Perhaps because Du Bois was strongly connected to Fisk alumni, Johnson thought it important to support him. Regardless of his reasoning, Johnson's support is evidence of his unconditional respect for Du Bois—the same man who fought rather vehemently against Johnson's selection as president and labeled him "reactionary."[22]

The Case of Lee Lorch

Perhaps the most complex incident in Johnson's record regarding civil liberties and academic freedom is the case of Lee Lorch. This incident pitted Johnson's philosophy of gaining equality for Blacks against his belief in academic freedom. A math professor and PhD from the University of Cincinnati, Lee Lorch came to Fisk in September 1950 with excellent credentials but also as a controversial civil rights activist. When Charles Johnson appointed Lorch for an initial 3 years, he was well aware of Lorch's activism. Lorch had been denied reappointments at both the City College of New York and Pennsylvania State College because of his political activities on behalf of Blacks. Despite Lorch's reputation, Johnson gave him an opportunity when other institutions did not. According to Ellen Schrecker, "To get such a job, a full-time, tenure-track position in an American college, a blacklisted professor would have to go to the South to the small, poor, denominational Negro colleges that were so desperate for qualified faculty members that they would hire anybody with a Ph.D., including teachers other educational institutions dared not touch."[23]

Although Schrecker's description of private HBCUs during the 1950s is representative of many of these colleges, Fisk University was a special case. While speaking of the majority of HBCUs in the most scathing terms—as "academic disaster areas"—Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, writing in 1968, placed Fisk among an elite group of Black colleges. Although meager relative to that of predominantly White institutions, Fisk had a sizable endowment of just over $4 million and no operating deficit. Furthermore, the Fisk University that had accepted Lee Lorch on its faculty was the same institution that attracted Sterling A. Brown, Horace Mann Bond, E. Franklin Frazier, James Weldon Johnson, Robert E. Park, Arna Bontemps, John Hope Franklin, Robert Hayden, and Aaron Doug-

las. Johnson was instrumental in persuading the majority of these scholars to come to Fisk and saw the hiring of the academically well-respected Lorch as yet another step toward moving Fisk into the mainstream of American higher education. Johnson may have had a chance to hire someone less controversial than Lorch, but perhaps he believed that Lorch would adapt his methods to the specific situation of the South and that the two of them could work together. Other activists for Black equality would be less direct in their approach when working in the South than in the North. Johnson may have expected Lorch to do the same.[24]

Lorch proved to be a model faculty member in terms of his teaching, research, and involvement with students. Upon accepting the appointment at Fisk, Lorch was made the acting chair of the mathematics department; after a year, he officially became chair of the department. Following his initial 3-year contract, he was reappointed for another 2-year period, although the question of his tenure was deferred until 1955. Lorch easily moved from associate to full professor, and, according to his colleagues, he was a respected member of the Fisk community. In fact, the Fisk math department reached its highest level of excellence as a result of the work of Lorch and Drs. Robert and Gertrude Rempfer. During Lorch's stay at Fisk, five of his students went on to get PhDs in math or math education—"a very high percentage in a school whose total enrollment was about 400." Lorch's students were among the first from Fisk's math department to pursue a PhD.[25]

At Fisk, Lorch continued his efforts on behalf of civil rights for African Americans. Along with three other faculty members, Lorch made a concerted effort to end discrimination within the American Mathematical Society and the Mathematical Association of America. In a 1951 *Science* article, Lorch stated, "It is our view that the scientific societies, with their talk of the international character of science, must recognize its interracial character and put an end to discriminatory practices at meetings, etc." Lorch also became active within the NAACP, serving as state vice president and a member of the Nashville chapter.[26]

Although White, Lee Lorch lived near Fisk, "in the heart of the Black community." Following the Supreme Court's 1954 decision that declared segregation in public education unconstitutional, Lorch and Robert and Gertrude Rempfer petitioned the Nashville school board to admit their daughters to Pearl Elementary School, an all-Black school near the Fisk campus.[27] According to Lorch, he and the Rempfers felt compelled to establish "an atmosphere of peaceful compliance with this decision [the *Brown* decision] and to show there was white support in the South for it." Their requests "were denied pending a final implementation decree by the United States Supreme Court." Upon hearing the school board's decision, Z. Alexander Looby, a Black city councilman and attorney for the NAACP, announced that legal action would be taken against the school board. On September 7, 1954, Lorch was subpoenaed by HUAC and was required to testify in Dayton, Ohio, on September 15 of that year.[28]

According to Lorch, the *Nashville Tennessean* knew about the subpoena before it was served and informed President Johnson immediately. He thinks that it is likely that the *Tennessean* provoked the subpoena:

> At that time the *Nashville Tennessean* was a very prominent newspaper, and it was busy backing Gordon Browning for governor. Browning was running on a platform of preservation of segregation. He said that one hundred percent of the whites and ninety-nine percent of the blacks wanted things to stay as they were. He would see that they did. This was his program. And of course our action showed that the one hundred percent wasn't quite one hundred percent. The *Nashville Tennessean* then began to make inquiries about me, and I was immediately subpoenaed by the House Un-American Activities Committee.[29]

In response to HUAC's questioning, Lee Lorch testified that he was not a member of the Communist party during his appointments at Fisk. In the opinion of both Warren Taylor and Frank Fetter of the AAUP, Lorch offered this testimony "contrary to his conscience, in order to safeguard his institution against unfavorable publicity." Lorch believed that "one of the purposes of this shotgun expedition was to smear Fisk University and to procure unfavorable publicity for it." An "unfriendly witness" (his words), he refused to answer questions regarding his past membership in the Communist party in 1941 during his graduate study at the University of Cincinnati, noting that political affiliations and activities were personal and guarded by the First Amendment. Although reported by one researcher as having invoked the Fifth Amendment so as to not incriminate himself, Lorch did not. As a result of his lack of cooperation with the HUAC, Lorch was cited for contempt of Congress.[30]

The next day, both the *Nashville Tennessean* and the *Nashville Banner* gave substantial coverage to the hearing and published a statement, released in advance, by Charles S. Johnson. Johnson stated, "Fisk's position regarding communism, in the present state of the nation and world, is forthright and unequivocal. We do not knowingly, employ or retain faculty members who hold this allegiance." Furthermore, Johnson declared that, "in these times, invoking the Fifth Amendment [*sic*] when there is a clear opportunity to affirm or deny is for all practical purposes tantamount to admission of membership. Under any such circumstances Fisk University would have to take prompt steps to release the person from its faculty."[31]

In preparing the advance press release, Charles Johnson most likely alluded to the wrong amendment. According to the AAUP, Johnson, who issued the statement without formal consultation with the Board of Trustees, probably drew no distinction between the First and Fifth Amendments—invoking either brought about the possibility of negative publicity. In making this statement, Johnson clearly placed avoiding the backlash from the local White community in front of defending the civil liberties of his faculty member.[32]

Over the next few weeks, Johnson let the Nashville papers know that the Board of Trustees would be reviewing Lorch's case and considering his dismissal from Fisk. On October 28, 1954, Lee Lorch appeared before the Fisk Board of Trustees at the request of President Johnson, who told him to "hold himself in readiness to answer questions." Ironically, charges were never brought against Lorch by the university, nor did he receive any official statement from President Johnson. In fact, Lorch's main source of information on his status within the

university was the local press. During his appearance before the Fisk Board of Trustees, Lorch gave a prepared statement that was 13 single-spaced pages in length. The majority of the statement criticized the HUAC and its procedures. However, Lorch also made it clear that he believed this incident was a retaliation by Nashville segregationists, who disagreed with his activism on behalf of Black civil rights.[33]

The decision to dismiss Lorch did not come quickly. On November 19, 1954, with one member dissenting, the Fisk Board of Trustees voted not to renew Lee Lorch's appointment at the university. According to Lorch, the Fisk board initially voted 17 to 2 in favor of retaining him, but "then one of the white members of the board, a local manufacturer, got up and . . . said that if . . . [the] decision stands, he . . . [would] resign from the board and spread his resignation in the press, and that the other dissenting member would do the same." Although Lorch attributes a great amount of power to this local manufacturer (Dan May), according to John Hope Franklin, who was present at the board meeting, "Dan May didn't have great influence and usually didn't understand the issues being discussed."

Several months later, at the next quarterly board meeting, a board-appointed executive committee voted 10 to 1 not to renew Lorch's contract. Although Lorch continued to petition the Fisk board, the executive committee's decision was approved on April 29, 1955, by the full board, with all White members present voting for Lorch's dismissal and most Black trustees voting to retain him. However, a few Black trustees, including John Hope Franklin, supported Johnson and felt that Lorch was given due process. It is clear that Johnson was as responsible for the move to dismiss Lorch as the White trustees.[34]

Prior to and after Lorch's "official" dismissal, many Fisk faculty, staff, alumni, and students pledged their support for him. Along with several other faculty members, Professor Nelson Fuson of the physics department offered to take a cut in pay to make up a salary for Lee Lorch. Furthermore, the local chapter of the AAUP came to Lorch's defense. Faculty and students circulated petitions, wrote letters, held meetings, and spoke to the administration on Lorch's behalf. A later AAUP investigation noted that "twenty-two student leaders, 150 alumni, 157 citizens, . . . [and] forty-seven of seventy eligible faculty members, . . . made representation to President Johnson and the Board in behalf of the retention of Professor Lorch." Although this investigation reprimanded Johnson for a violation of academic freedom, the authors do not give a detailed definition of academic freedom; they merely refer to Lorch's constitutional rights as a citizen. As Ellen Schrecker points out in her 1986 publication *No Ivory Tower*, as late as 1953 there was not a single agreed-upon definition of academic freedom.[35]

On the subject of the campus-wide uproar that arose over the Lorch controversy, Patrick Gilpin states, "Lorch did nothing to discourage this support and apparently was a participant, if not an organizer." Although he may have assisted in the organization of activities, it is apparent that Lorch's friends were profoundly loyal and defended his integrity and rights. They admired his steadfast fight for civil rights, respected his professional competency, or valued his personal right of association and his academic right to freedom. However, it was

precisely these activities on his behalf that the board cited as a reason for Lorch's dismissal: "There has been continual agitation of the question on the campus to the detriment of the pursuit of teaching and studying . . . stimulated by some person or persons who had little or no regard for the adverse effect that it might have on the healthy pursuit of learning."[36]

In Johnson's mind, the greatest good for Fisk was to disassociate the university from Lorch. Perhaps this is the reason why he returned Lorch's National Science Foundation (NSF) award. According to Lorch, "Shortly after my appearance before HUAC, the National Science Foundation approved my application for a research grant [the first such for Fisk]. Without consulting me, Dr. Johnson returned the check to NSF."

A Decision to Secure Fisk's Future

Why would Charles Johnson, an ardent advocate of civil rights, not have fought to retain a man whose views on Black advancement were similar to his own? On the surface, the decision not to renew Lorch's contract seems merely an example of the denial of academic freedom and the reasonable safeguards of academic due process. However, to reach this conclusion ignores the important issues of Johnson's leadership style, the history of Fisk, and the context of the South in the 1950s.[37]

Charles Johnson's dismissal of Lorch had little to do with the difference between invoking the First or Fifth Amendment or Lorch's right to do so under the concept of academic freedom. Instead, the dismissal was most likely based on a difference in the type of civil rights activism practiced by Johnson and Lorch. Charles Johnson knew the South. Johnson doubted the effectiveness of large-scale protest events because he thought that, under southern conditions, they might lead to violence and be more detrimental than helpful. Instead of promoting acts of civil disobedience, Johnson took a pragmatic approach and tried to find allies within the White power structure. He used research to convince these allies, such as Edwin Embree, Will Alexander, and John Hay Whitney, to change the direction of Black higher education from industrial to liberal in the early 1930s and to assist young Black scholars in their quest for educational funding. Whereas other race relations leaders, including Du Bois, tended to fight racism primarily in the Northeast, Johnson chose to stay in the South.[38]

In contrast to Johnson, Lorch was from the Northeast and was much more idealistic and confrontational in his approach. In one instance, Lorch sublet his Stuyvesant Town apartment to a Black family in open defiance of that New York housing project's policy of excluding Blacks. In the words of Nelson Fuson, Lorch's colleague, "Lorch was an activist for integration. Many people were afraid that they, or the breadwinners of their family, would risk being fired if they publicly supported an unpopular cause like desegregation even if it was the correct cause. But Lorch was not one of these!"[39]

As a college president, Johnson wanted to make sure that his style prevailed. In the past, Johnson had sometimes been possessive of his creations. For example, Johnson was criticized by several other Black sociologists—W. E. B.

Du Bois, E. Franklin Frazier—for hoarding research resources for Fisk and acting as the gatekeeper of Black sociological research. According to Butler Jones, as head of the Fisk race relations institute, Johnson had exercised control over the field of Black sociology and race relations research. However, Jones also notes that Johnson was praised by many Black sociologists. They "freely admitted [their] indebtedness to him for his work in maintaining at Fisk a center for the education and training of blacks in the intricacies of sociological research." Johnson continued this diligent yet controlling style of management as president of Fisk. He was known among the faculty as a demanding leader. Certainly, this style of leadership would have come into conflict with Lorch's forward actions.[40]

Although his decision to dismiss Lorch was not honorable, in making it, Johnson was being true to his own agenda of securing Fisk's future. Johnson knew well the potential backlash Fisk might receive from a decision to retain Lorch. Even Lee Lorch acknowledged that Johnson was under a great amount of pressure:

> It must be understood what a black institution is. It's not an institution controlled by African-Americans; it's one attended by them. The control still rests in the hands of those who control the rest of society. With some of the historically black institutions of the South, in those days, every single member of the board was white. . . . The then president of Fisk was the first nonwhite president in its history.[41]

As under the presidency of McKenzie, when Nashville Whites criticized Fisk for being too "radical," northern philanthropists became nervous about supporting the institution. Although his defense of Du Bois and the subject matter at the race relations institutes showed that he would not cave in to outside pressure under every circumstance, Johnson understood that Fisk's survival depended on at least a few allies within the White community. In the Lorch incident, it was apparent that those few allies had retreated. Although not merely a puppet of philanthropists, as McKenzie had been, Johnson had to be particular about the battles he fought. He made his decisions with the best interest of Fisk in mind.

Just as Johnson was detailed, almost meticulous, about the research and activities of the Fisk race relations institutes, he had his own vision of how Fisk would react to the *Brown* decision. After *Brown*, the atmosphere in the local community was tense, and Johnson chose to put the survival of Fisk before the testing of *Brown*. That he made this decision was no accident when we consider his philosophy on integration. Although he supported *Brown* by contributing research toward Kenneth Clark's studies and making affirmative public statements after the decision, Johnson clearly believed that integration alone would not bring about Black equality. When asked in 1942 whether Blacks should insist upon integration, he replied, "No, because integration is not something that can be commanded or conferred. They should insist upon equality of status in their own right as Negroes and without social and economic penalties for their physical differences." Contrary to those who thought that the legal end to segregation made HBCUs unnecessary, Johnson saw a continuing need for these

institutions. At the 1956 United Negro College Fund campaign meeting, Johnson said with conviction:

> The time is now to strengthen these colleges; to give their virtues greater power in this crisis. These institutions are not beggars; nor are they or should they ever become the pathological and apologetic symbols of the intellectual products of their nurturing. The time is now to help them set the example for the nation, of a democratic and dynamic education, that can save the nation itself for its greater destiny in the world.

Although the vehemence of Johnson's statement could be attributed to the "rhetoric of fund raising," Johnson "rarely practiced the art of hyperbole" during his career. It is likely that Johnson, a lifelong champion of Black colleges, was expressing a deeply felt conviction.[42]

For Charles Johnson, dismissing Lee Lorch was not an easy decision. In fact, he told Nelson Fuson in confidence that Lorch was wronged but that he had to do it for the institution. Perhaps this is why, in writing to the president of Philander Smith College regarding Lorch's future employment, he gave a shining recommendation of Lorch and went to great lengths to avoid mentioning the controversy: "I shall only say that Dr. Lorch is a very competent mathematician. Our decision not to renew his contract was not on the basis of his mathematical ability or his racial attitudes."

From the perspective of the post–civil rights era, it is difficult to understand why Johnson might have dismissed such a strong supporter of Black equality. Was he forced to make this decision? Although Johnson was under a great amount of pressure from southern Whites, his history of independent decision making proves him to be more than just their pawn. Johnson most likely viewed Lorch's dismissal as a necessary sacrifice for the long-term benefit of Black higher education, specifically at Fisk. In certain instances, values collide in ways that make it impossible to take the "right" course of action from all viewpoints. Such was the case in Johnson's decision to dismiss Lee Lorch. Johnson saw Fisk as an institution that would meet the needs of Blacks in a transitional era—an era free of legal segregation but without a guarantee of full integration. Johnson understood that to secure Fisk's future existence and prosperity he needed, at various times, cooperation both from southern Whites and from the Fisk community. Given the current backlash against affirmative action, it is apparent that this transitional era is not yet over. Colleges such as Fisk still have a role to play in guaranteeing equal education to Blacks and providing diverse cultural centers.[43]

The questions of academic freedom raised by the Lee Lorch case are unresolved to this day. Although the American academy adopted the German concept of academic freedom, the extent of this professorial right has always been unclear. Because of the pragmatic nature of American higher education, with its increasing attention to social, political, and applied sciences, American professors were more likely to operate within the public sphere than their German counterparts. Unlike the Germans, the Americans were operating under a constitutional guarantee of free speech, one that was afforded to all American citizens.

These factors led them to demand greater freedom in public utterances outside of their discipline. When the AAUP first created the guidelines for academic freedom, there was an effort to expand the German concept to include free speech and even political activism outside of the classroom. This effort provoked a backlash by some who thought that this kind of freedom shielded professors from any responsibility for their actions—including actions that were detrimental to their own institutions. Unlike other public figures, who were given free speech but were expected to bear the consequences of unpopular opinions, professors were asking for a broad mandate to express their opinions on all subjects without negative career consequences.

The final statement of the AAUP regarding "extramural utterances" was ambivalent. On the one hand, it noted that professors should not be prohibited from "expression to their judgments upon controversial questions, or that their freedom of speech outside the university should be limited to questions falling within their own specialties. . . . [Furthermore, they should not be denied the right to] support . . . organized movements which they believe to be in the public interest." On the other hand, it was quick to point out the need for professors to avoid making "hasty or unverified or exaggerated statements, and to refrain from intemperate or sensational modes of expression." As stated in 1955 by Richard Hofstadter and Walter Metzger, the extent of academic freedom continues to be a "vexing question."

The Lorch incident provides a good example of how this debate over the extent of academic freedom plays out in a politically charged setting. No one challenged Lee Lorch's competence as a researcher and teacher; instead, the decision to dismiss Lorch concerned his right to participate in a form of political activism that could have harmed the university. Similar incidents continue to occur today. In a recent interview, historian Ellen Schrecker stated:

> Professors may be losing their ability and willingness to speak out on issues outside the classroom. Because of the job crunch, junior faculty are so insecure that they cannot now openly take political positions as they did in the 1960s. Junior faculty—and this, of course, would apply to adjuncts as well—are deprived of the opportunity to act in their capacity as citizens.

Today, universities are increasingly adopting a corporate model—downsizing, outsourcing, and replacing tenured faculty positions with adjuncts. These practices put pressure on faculty members to curtail political involvement that might bring negative publicity to their institutions. Just as the fear of negative public opinion in a racially hostile, segregated South was the impetus for dismissing Lorch, today's universities are being pressured to adopt a narrow view of academic freedom that prohibits professors from advocating on behalf of unpopular causes. The context of a Black college shows the impact of economic pressure on the academic setting. When an institution is constantly under pressure to garner funds from remotely connected sources, there is a strong tendency to follow the status quo. The lack of financial resources of many alumni and parents of Black colleges means that these institutions must rely more heavily on

foundation support.[44] This helps us to understand the actions of Charles S. Johnson at Fisk but also underscores the need for clarification of how far the concept of academic freedom should reach.[45]

Notes

This work was generously funded by both the Indiana University Center on Philanthropy and the Rockefeller Foundation. I wish to thank the staffs at the Fisk University Special Collections, the Rockefeller Archive Center, and the Indiana University library for their assistance with this project. Furthermore, I am grateful to the following individuals who took the time to review this article prior to its publication: Andrea Walton, B. Edward McClellan, Michael Parsons, Jonathan Zimmerman, Ellen Schrecker, Patrick Gilpin, Anthony E. Hargrove, Robert S. Evans, and Edward Epstein. Their critical review is appreciated. An earlier version of this article was presented at the Organization of American Historians annual meeting in Indianapolis, Indiana, 1998.

[1]Jack Dvorak and Jon Dilts, "Academic Freedom vs. Administrative Authority," *Journalism Educator* 47 (Fall 1992): 3–12; *Wieman v. Updegraft*, 344 U.S. 183 (1952).

[2]*Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

[3]Charles S. Johnson, "Famous Sociologist Asks, Answers Some Key Questions for Negroes," *The Chicago Defender*, 26 September 1942, 32–33.

[4]Joe Richardson, *A History of Fisk University, 1865–1946* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama, 1980); James A. Anderson, *The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860–1935* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988).

[5]James D. Anderson, "Philanthropic Control Over Private Black Higher Education," in *Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism: The Foundations at Home and Abroad*, ed. Robert Arnove (Boston: G. K. Hall & Co., 1980).

[6]Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, *The Academic Revolution* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968); Merle Curti and Roderick Nash, *Philanthropy in the Shaping of American Higher Education* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1965); Stephen Peeps, "Northern Philanthropy and the Emergence of Black Higher Education—Do-Gooders, Compromisers, or Co-Conspirators," *Journal of Negro Education* 50 (Summer 1981): 265; Raymond Fosdick, *Adventure in Giving: The Story of the General Education Board* (New York: Harper & Row, 1962), 323.

[7]Edward Berman, *The Influence of the Carnegie, Ford, and Rockefeller Foundations on American Foreign Policy: The Ideology of Philanthropy* (New York: State University of New York Press, 1983). The reference to several others includes Anderson, "Philanthropic Control"; Anderson, *The Education of Blacks in the South*; Ronald Butchart, *Northern Schools, Southern Blacks, and Reconstruction: Freedmen's Education, 1862–1875* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1980); Butchart, "Outthinking and Outflanking the Owners of the World: A Historiography of the African American Struggle for Education," *History of Education Quarterly* 28 (1988): 333–366; Vincent P. Franklin and James A. Anderson, eds., *New Perspectives on Black Educational History* (Boston: G. K. Hall & Co., 1978); Manning Marable, "Booker T. Washington and the Political Economy of Black Education in the United States, 1880–1915," *Teaching Education* 3, no. 1 (1990); Peeps, "Northern Philanthropy"; Robert Stuckert, "The Negro College—A Pawn of White Domination," *The Wisconsin Sociologist* (January 1964); William Watkins, "Teaching and Learning in the Black Colleges: A 130-Year Retrospective," *Teaching Education* 3, no. 1 (1990).

[8]James Merrill, quoted in American Unitarian Association, *From Servitude to Service* (Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1905), 211–212.

[9]Charles Willie and Ronald Edmonds, *Black Colleges in America: Challenge, Development, Survival* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1978), 76; W. E. B. Du Bois, *The Education of Black People: Ten Critiques, 1906–1960*, ed. H. Aptheker (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1973); Minutes of the Board of Trustees of Fisk University, 25 June 1908, Fisk University Archives, Nashville, Tennessee.

[10]Anderson, *The Education of Blacks in the South*.

[11]Fisk Endowment Campaign, Memorandum, 25 May 1923, Box 23, General Education Board Papers (Rockefeller Archive Center, Tarrytown, New York); Minutes of the Board of

Trustees of Fisk University, 9 November 1915 (Fisk University Archives, Nashville, Tennessee); Minutes of the Board of Trustees of Fisk University, 2 May 1921 (Fisk University Archives, Nashville, Tennessee).

[12]Richard Hofstadter and Walter P. Metzger, *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States* (New York: Columbia University, 1955).

[13]Richardson, *A History of Fisk University*; W. E. B. Du Bois, "Diuturni Silenti," in *The Education of Black People*, 41; Anderson, *The Education of Blacks in the South*.

[14]Both Richardson, *A History of Fisk University*, and Anderson, *The Education of Blacks in the South*, claim that the student revolt was a major factor in Fayette McKenzie's resignation. For more information on student revolts on Black college campuses during the 1920s, see Raymond Wolters, *The New Negro on Campus: Black College Rebellions of the 1920s* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1975). For information on the disparaging difference between the Fisk and Hampton endowments, see Peeps, "Northern Philanthropy," 251–269.

[15]Although commonly referred to as Dr. Johnson, he did not have a PhD. His graduate work at the University of Chicago was cut short, and he received a PhB (bachelor of philosophy).

[16]Those who credit *Opportunity* with the spawning of the Harlem Renaissance include Mary Schmidt Campbell et al., *Harlem Renaissance: Art of Black America* (Harlem, N.Y.: Abradale Press, Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1982); Patrick Gilpin, "Charles S. Johnson: Entrepreneur of the Harlem Renaissance," in *The Harlem Renaissance Remembered*, ed. A. Bontemps (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1972); Gilpin, "Charles S. Johnson: An Intellectual Biography" (PhD dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1973); Blyden Jackson, "A Postlude to a Renaissance," *Southern Review* 25 (1990): 746–765; David Levering Lewis, *When Harlem Was in Vogue* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981); Guichard Parris and Lester Brooks, *Blacks in the City: A History of the National Urban League* (Toronto: Little, Brown & Co., 1971); Ralph Pearson, "Charles S. Johnson: The Urban League Years" (PhD dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1971); Ralph Pearson, "Combating Racism With Art: Charles S. Johnson and the Harlem Renaissance," *American Studies* 18 (1977): 123–134; J. Vincent, "Philadelphia's Afro-American Literary Circle and the Harlem Renaissance" (PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1980).

[17]Robert King, *Civil Rights and the Idea of Freedom* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992); John Kirby, *Black Americans in the Roosevelt Era: Liberalism and Race* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1980); Charles S. Johnson, *Into the Mainstream: A Survey of Best Practices in Race Relations in the South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1947); Charles S. Johnson, *Shadow of the Plantation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934); Willis Weatherford and Charles S. Johnson, *Race Relations: Adjustment of Whites and Negroes in the United States* (Boston: D. C. Heath, 1934); Richard Robbins, *Sidelines Activist: Charles S. Johnson and the Struggle for Civil Rights* (University, Miss.: University of Mississippi Press, 1996).

[18]Gilpin, "Charles S. Johnson: An Intellectual Biography"; Gilpin, "Charles S. Johnson: Entrepreneur of the Harlem Renaissance."

[19]Warren Taylor and Frank Fetter, "Academic Freedom and Tenure: Fisk University," *American Association of University Professors Bulletin* 45 (March 1959): 33.

[20]The National Sharecroppers Fund was labeled a communist front by HUAC. Charles S. Johnson, quoted in Robbins, *Sidelines Activist*, 149.

[21]Ellen Schrecker, *No Ivory Tower: McCarthyism and the Universities* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986).

[22]*A Soliloquy on Viewing My Life From the Last Decade of Its First Century: The Autobiography of W. E. B. Du Bois*, ed. H. Aptheker (New York: International Publishers, 1968), 391; Herbert Aptheker, ed., *The Correspondence of W. E. B. Du Bois* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1978), 306–307.

[23]Lee Lorch was recommended to the university by Judge Hubert T. Delany, who was one of the first African American judges in New York City and a close friend of Charles Johnson. For more information on Lee Lorch's political activities prior to his position at Fisk, see Cedric Belfrage, *The American Inquisition, 1945–1960* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1973); David Caute, *The Great Fear: The Anti-Communist Purge Under Truman and Eisenhower* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1978); Griffen Fariello, *Red Scare: Memories of the American Inquisition. An Oral History* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1995); Gilpin, "Charles S. Johnson: An Intellectual Biography"; Patrick Gilpin, "Charles S. Johnson and the Second Red Scare: An Episode," *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* 37 (1978): 76–88; Robbins, *Sidelines Activist*; and Schrecker, *No Ivory Tower*, 289.

[24]Jencks and Riesman, *The Academic Revolution*, 433. For evidence of Johnson's instrumental role in bringing prominent scholars to Fisk, see Folder 14, Box 41, Charles S. Johnson Papers (Fisk University Archives, Nashville, Tennessee). For information on Johnson's goal of moving Fisk into the mainstream, see Gilpin, "Charles S. Johnson: An Intellectual Biography," and Gilpin, "Charles S. Johnson and the Second Red Scare." Robbins, *Sidelines Activist*, discusses Black activists who were less confrontational in their approach when in the South.

[25]Several of Lorch's former colleagues have commented on his stature on the Fisk campus: Nelson Fuson to author, 20 February 1998; Marian Fuson to author, 24 February 1998; Gladys Forde, interviewed by author via telephone, 27 March 1998. For additional information on the views of Lorch's colleagues at Fisk, see Gilpin, "Charles S. Johnson: An Intellectual Biography," and Gilpin, "Charles S. Johnson and the Second Red Scare." In a letter to the author dated 15 February 1998, Lee Lorch noted the high percentage of PhDs. For more information on the Fisk math department under Lorch's direction, see Vivienne Mayes, *American Mathematical Monthly* (November 1976).

[26]Lee Lorch, "Discriminatory Practices," *Science* 114 (1951): 161; Fariello, *Red Scare*.

[27]Lorch initially asked the principal of Pearl Elementary whether his daughter could enroll. The principal, who had known Lorch's daughter for years, said that he would welcome her.

[28]Lee Lorch, interview by author, 15 February 1998; Lee Lorch, quoted in Fariello, *Red Scare*, 493; "Fisk May Ask Lorch to Resign: Professor Dodges Queries on Links With Communism," *Nashville Tennessean*, 16 September 1954.

[29]Lee Lorch, interview by author, 15 February 1998; Lee Lorch, quoted in Fariello, *Red Scare*, 493.

[30]Taylor and Fetter, "Academic Freedom and Tenure," 44; "Lorch Says Committee Broke Rules Calling Him," *Nashville Banner*, 16 September 1954. Fariello, *Red Scare*, 493; Robbins, *Sidelines Activist*.

[31]"Lorch Says Committee Broke Rules Calling Him," *Nashville Banner*, 16 September 1954; "Fisk May Ask Lorch to Resign: Professor Dodges Queries on Links With Communism," *Nashville Tennessean*, 16 September 1954.

[32]Taylor and Fetter, "Academic Freedom and Tenure."

[33]Gilpin, "Charles S. Johnson and the Second Red Scare," 82; Gilpin, "Charles S. Johnson: An Intellectual Biography." The hearing was held to investigate communist infiltration in Dayton, Ohio. Lorch, who had only resided in Cincinnati, was not told this until he arrived before the committee (Fariello, *Red Scare*); Taylor and Fetter, "Academic Freedom and Tenure."

[34]Lee Lorch, quoted in Fariello, *Red Scare*, 493. The other dissenting member of the board was Wendall Phillips, the vice president of a major Nashville bank at the time. The one Black trustee was L. Howard Bennett, who went on to become assistant secretary of defense for the United States government and chair of the Fisk Board of Trustees. According to John Hope Franklin, "Charles Johnson assumed that Howard Bennett was his friend and would support him—when it came to Lee Lorch he did not" (John Hope Franklin, interview by author, 5 June 1998). Detailed information regarding the April 1955 board meeting is located in the Fisk Board of Trustee Minutes and Charles S. Johnson Papers (Fisk University Archives, Nashville, Tennessee). For more information on the specific voting patterns, see Fariello, *Red Scare*, and Taylor and Fetter, "Academic Freedom and Tenure."

[35]Taylor and Fetter, "Academic Freedom and Tenure," 35; Schrecker, *No Ivory Tower*.

[36]Supporters included Dr. William J. Zeigler, a Fisk alumnus and Chicago dentist; Dr. Percy L. Julian, the second Black ever elected to the National Academy of Sciences and a leading figure in organic chemistry; Reverend Henry Allen Boyd, president of the Citizens Savings Bank; and W. E. B. Du Bois. Although August Meier states, in *A White Scholar and the Black Community, 1945–1965* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1992), that W. E. B. Du Bois was not willing to oppose Lorch's dismissal, this assertion is inaccurate. See Du Bois's collected works, published by the University of Massachusetts (1973–1978), for his unambiguous opposition to Lorch's dismissal (Lee Lorch, interview with author, 26 February 1998). Robbins, *Sidelines Activist*; Warren and Fetter, "Academic Freedom and Tenure," 41; Gilpin, "Charles S. Johnson and the Second Red Scare," 83, 85; Gilpin, "Charles S. Johnson: An Intellectual Biography."

[37]Gilpin, "Charles S. Johnson and the Second Red Scare," 82; Gilpin, "Charles S. Johnson: An Intellectual Biography"; Taylor and Fetter, "Academic Freedom and Tenure." Lorch reapplied from his next post at Philander Smith College in Little Rock even before his trial on

charges of contempt of Congress. To its credit, NSF again awarded Lorch a grant. According to Lorch, "The president of PSC happily activated it" (Lee Lorch, interview by author, 15 February 1998).

[38]Taylor and Fetter, "Academic Freedom and Tenure"; Robbins, *Sidelines Activist*. Edwin Embree was the president of the Julius Rosenwald Fund until its closure in 1948. Will Alexander was the head of the American Missionary Association. John Hay Whitney was the founder and chair of the Whitney Foundation. Anderson, *The Education of Blacks in the South*; Jane Belke, "To Render Better Service: The Role of the Julius Rosenwald Fund Fellowship Program in Graduate and Professional Degrees of African Americans" (PhD dissertation, Indiana University, 1994); Kirby, *Black Americans in the Roosevelt Era*. Du Bois did spend time at Atlanta University in Atlanta, Georgia (as an instructor [1897–1910] and department chair [1934–1944]).

[39]Nelson Fuson to author, 20 February 1998.

[40]Gilpin, "Charles S. Johnson and the Second Red Scare"; Gilpin, "Charles S. Johnson: An Intellectual Biography"; Anthony Platt, *E. Franklin Frazier Reconsidered* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1991); Robbins, *Sidelines Activist*; John Stanfield, *Philanthropy and Jim Crow in American Social Science* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1985); Butler Jones, quoted in John Bracey, August Meier, and Elliott Rudwick, *The Black Sociologists: The First Half Century* (Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1971), 136.

[41]Robbins, *Sidelines Activist*; Gilpin, "Charles S. Johnson and the Second Red Scare"; Lee Lorch, quoted in Fariello, *Red Scare*, 494.

[42]Charles S. Johnson, Statement on Supreme Court Decision, 17 May 1954, Folder 34, Box 174, Charles S. Johnson Papers (Fisk University Archives, Nashville, Tennessee). The Southern Educational Reporting Service was organized in 1954 in Nashville as a race relations information dissemination center to assist peaceful transitions in the midst of the *Brown* decision and afterward. Kenneth B. Clark, *Prejudice and Your Child* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1955); Charles S. Johnson, "Famous Sociologist Asks, Answers Some Key Questions for Negroes," *The Chicago Defender*, 26 September 1942. Charles S. Johnson, "The Time Is Now," Remarks at the United Negro College Fund campaign meeting, Detroit, Michigan, 18 July 1956, Charles S. Johnson Papers (Fisk University Archives, Nashville, Tennessee); Ralph Pearson, "Reflections on Black Colleges: The Historical Perspective of Charles S. Johnson," *History of Education Quarterly* 23 (1983): 55–68.

[43]Nelson Fuson, interviewed by Richard Robbins, Nashville, Tennessee, 12 June 1975; M. LaFayette Harris to Charles S. Johnson, 8 July 1955, Charles S. Johnson to M. LaFayette Harris, 13 July 1955, Folder 6, Box 29, Charles S. Johnson Papers (Fisk University Special Collections, Nashville, Tennessee). *American Association of University Professors Bulletin*, No. 1 (December 1915): 35–37. Hofstadter and Metzger, *The Development of Academic Freedom*, 411.

[44]According to the *Journal of Blacks in Higher Education* (Winter 1998/1999, no. 22) and the U.S. Census Bureau, the most striking evidence of racial inequality in the United States is that the median net worth per Black family is $4,418, as compared with the median net worth of a White family, which is $45,740.

[45]Stanley Katz, "A Conversation With Academe's Ellen Schrecker," *Organization of American Historians Newsletter* 27 (February 1999): 1, 4.

Manuscript received June 25, 1998
Revision received February 1, 1999
Accepted March 19, 1999