"A UNIVERSITY WORTHY OF THE NAME"
Political Intellectuals and the New Left at Arizona State University
by Carrie Deakin

Introduction

In December 1965, an eighteen-year-old freshman named Dennis McIntyre withdrew from Arizona State University in Tempe, after a meeting with the Student Disciplinary Committee to discuss the sign he had carried into a teach-in on the Vietnam War two months earlier. The sign McIntyre brought into ASU's Memorial Union did not express opposition to U.S. involvement in Vietnam. Rather, it was a clear statement of support for U.S. policy. The problem was the four-letter word McIntyre used to express how he felt about communism. Four faculty members defended McIntyre's freedom of speech: George Peek from the political science department; Morris Starkey from the philosophy department; and Thomas Holt and John Hudson, both of the sociology department. Paradoxically, the four professors were labeled "Un-American" and "Anti-Boy Scout" in their defense of free speech, even though the speech they defended was explicitly anti-communist in its sentiment. ASU vice president Joseph Schabacker, head of the disciplinary committee, allegedly pressured McIntyre to quit school, and accused him of "consorting with 'wolves in sheep's clothing.'" Schabacker
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said McIntyre’s problem was that he was taking advice from faculty members of “questionable integrity.” While McIntyre’s use of the F-word was considered serious enough to warrant full-scale disciplinary action, an ASU cheerleader who had recently yelled “Screw the U” at a football game against the University of Arizona was called in front of the disciplinary committee and merely “told to wash his mouth out with lye soap.” It seemed that administration officials determined what constituted inappropriate or offensive speech based on the context in which it was given. A cheerleader’s use of inappropriate language at a football game was less offensive than a student’s use of a curse word at a political lecture, even though both phrases had similar meanings.

McIntyre’s “dirty word case,” as the local press called it, exemplified the conservative environment at ASU during the mid-1960s, as well as the commitment of some faculty members to protect free speech on campus. ASU administrators wanted students and faculty members alike to go quietly about the business of education; but not all faculty members bought into the conformity that ASU administrators demanded. Controversies over free speech on campus, academic freedom, and the role of the university in the broader community led to resignations and terminations, particularly of faculty central to the New Left movement at ASU.

**Intellectuals and the New Left**

Student dissent on American college campuses during the 1950s and 1960s was influenced by a small number of faculty sympathizers, or “political intellectuals,” who participated in and articulated the goals of social movements. At Arizona State University, New Left academics, with their support of free inquiry, free speech, and dissent, provided the “intellectual authority” that facilitated student movements. Two ASU philosophy professors in particular—Harry Bracken and Morris Starsky—emerged in the 1960s as leaders of Phoenix’s New Left. Although Bracken and Starsky certainly had political motivations for their involvement with the New Left, they also saw it as part of their job as professors to champion academic freedom and free speech on campus. When presented with challenges to their politics, Bracken and Starsky struggled to educate the public on the role of the university and to assert their rights to professional autonomy on campus. Disputes over academic freedom illustrate the friction between the university administration and faculty members in debates over the function of the university and academic practice, as well as the tensions between intellectuals and ordinary citizens regarding the purpose of university education. Much of the backlash Bracken and Starsky encountered can be attributed to the local context. Although emerging Phoenix had tried to sell itself as a progressive community during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, by the 1950s, conservatism was firmly entrenched in the city’s politics and culture. This climate explains some of the hostility local residents felt toward New Left intellectuals at ASU.

**Phoenix Rising**

Mining prospects attracted the first Anglo settlers to present-day Phoenix in the 1860s. The Salt River Valley’s climate fostered the development of agriculture, as settlers cleaned out prehistoric
irrigation canals and built new ones. As farming became more widespread, Phoenix constructed a transportation system around which an entire economic and social structure evolved. While Phoenicians built churches, schools, and other institutions associated with a "cultured, liberal and progressive" community, the city struggled to cast-off its misleading image as a "western" town filled with ranchers, cattlemen, and Indians. Much of Phoenix's growth during the first half of the twentieth century was intended to flaunt the city's modernity and its distinctly "American" character. Phoenicians particularly valued education for its social and cultural significance. Schools, representing "learning and opportunity . . . , served as important community meeting places, and . . . offered a way to demonstrate the community's worthiness." Phoenix boosters, recognizing the importance of education in other parts of the country, were more concerned about building high-quality facilities and encouraging large enrollment than with educational content and standards.

Disputes between unions and the mining industry during WWI contributed to the development of an increasingly conservative political culture in Phoenix, and in Arizona in general. This rightward shift in politics continued during the 1940s, as the war effort changed the foundation of Phoenix's economy from agriculture to service and manufacturing. Defense industries, particularly aviation, were attracted to Phoenix because of its clear skies and favorable flying conditions. Companies like Goodyear Tire and Rubber set up plants in the Valley to fulfill government contracts, and brought with them a massive labor force that increased the Valley's population. The population boom produced demographic changes that included a surge in "primarily conservative, middle-aged and elderly voters." Manufacturing, which was a minor part of the economy before WWII, boomed in 1942-1943, before falling below national levels in 1945. The end of hostilities threatened to devastate the economy that had built up around war industries. Political leaders responded by instituting tax reforms to benefit businesses, such as the 1949 voter-approved law that eliminated or eased corporate taxes. In 1955, voters repealed a state sales tax on products manufactured for sale to the federal government, reinforcing the ties between Phoenix-based businesses and government contracts. The Cold War sustained Phoenix's military-industrial complex, and by 1955, manufacturing was the city's primary income base, followed by farming and tourism, respectively. Phoenix's annual income from manufacturing jumped from $5 million in 1940 to $135 million in 1963, with most of the revenue generated from aircraft, machinery, and metal fabrication industries. With the tie between business and government firmly in place, Phoenix business leaders and politicians envisioned developing a university that would train workers to maintain and expand the manufacturing economy.

Origins of Arizona State University

WWII fundamentally altered the role of the American university. Before the war, universities were dedicated to the scientific method and humanistic inquiry, and provided a space for building the character of students who were, more often than not, "the sons of the nation's business and professional elites." Most significantly, the prewar university was considered independent of the interests of government and private industry. National defense concerns in the build-up to WWII, however, prompted the federal government to look to the universities for cutting-edge research to develop new technology for the war effort. Radar and the atom bomb are two notable developments that sprang from the relationship between "academic scientists and the federal government." Federal spending on scientific research continued through the Cold War era and contributed to university expansion.

The university has traditionally been a site where new identities are formed and markers of social status are acquired. Higher education can transition working-class youth to at least lower middle-class status. As the role and function of the university changed during the postwar period, a new working class of technicians, scientists, white-collar office workers, and other professionals emerged that blurred the line between manual and intellectual labor, and therefore skewed the distinction between working-class and middle-class. College-educated, holding managerial or technical jobs, and usually salaried, they viewed themselves as middle-class solely on the basis of their ability to purchase consumer goods and because their advanced degrees conferred social status "at least above that of many factory workers with a high school education."
Motorola electronics, which had supplied walkie-talkie systems for the military during WWII, established a base in Phoenix in 1948. The company’s head of research, Daniel Noble, formerly an engineering professor at Connecticut State College, chose the Valley for its climate, its proximity to defense contractors in California and atomic energy works in New Mexico, and its “resort atmosphere.” Arizona State College (ASC), in nearby Tempe, was another incentive, because it offered the “potential for the development of quality engineering programs.” In 1956, Noble won government contracts that allowed Motorola to expand. The company’s growth demanded more highly educated workers, particularly men and women trained in engineering and computer science. Noble began exploring ways to transform ASC from a small teaching school into a research institution. He met frequently with ASC president Grady Gammage, who encouraged the Arizona Board of Regents in 1955 to restructure ASC into four colleges, one of which included an engineering school.

Phoenix business leaders and politicians, who recognized that upgrading ASC to university status (meaning that it could grant advanced degrees) would attract more corporations like Motorola and General Electric, petitioned the Arizona State Legislature to take the issue to voters. In 1958, voters approved changing ASC to Arizona State University. ASC’s enrollment had already been on the rise from 553 in 1945 to 9,708 in 1958, and by 1960, 11,128 students were enrolled at Arizona State University. Nationally, high-tech industries had been assembling around universities such as Stanford and Berkeley in California and Harvard and MIT in Boston. Phoenix boosters and university officials hoped to model their city and ASU around the California and Boston archetypes, asserting that the “development of Arizona’s industrial and business potential depends upon the university’s future.” With the approval of voters and taxpayers, Arizona State University was essentially created as a result of the expanding manufacturing economy.

ASU president G. Homer Durham’s address at a Diamond Jubilee Convocation in 1960 reflected the university’s purpose. Its business-like title, “The Tradition of Growth and the Commitment to Quality,” suggests the degree to which higher education was tied to profit-making and enterprise. Durham defined ASU’s objectives as the “development of leadership for the United States of America, for the extension and safety of free societies, recognizing the religious and moral nature of American society—in contrast with either communist, pagan, or ‘post-Christian’ societies.” Seeming to anticipate the controversies that would stem from questions about the university’s role, Durham set a clear agenda of non-interference in politics. “The University is not an ‘action agency,’” he explained. “True, we educate for action in business, for social and political leadership. But as a University we leave the current operation of General Motors, the churches, American industry, the newspapers and social reform to the political parties, the legislatures, the corporations, the labor unions, and all the rest.”

Durham’s ASU was dedicated to the “business” of knowledge, rather than to education for the sake of education. Subsequent controversies revolving around the ideologies and political activities of faculty members Harry Bracken and Morris Staskey quickly demonstrated that questions about the university’s character and purpose were far from resolved.

**Harry Bracken**

Harry Bracken specialized in the history of seventeenth and eighteenth century philosophy. A WWII navy veteran, he had taught at the University of Minnesota for two years before coming to ASU in 1963. He was promoted to full professor in the spring of 1964. Influenced by Henry David Thoreau, Noam Chomsky, and A. J. Muste, Bracken was regarded as the driving force behind initial opposition to the Vietnam War among ASU faculty members. Bracken’s activism was not limited to the Vietnam War, however. He also was ardently committed to academic freedom, struggling throughout his brief faculty career to establish a tradition of free inquiry at a university that was still less than ten years old. As such, Bracken was central to the emerging New Left at ASU, providing the intellectual authority that sparked involvement from students and other philosophy professors. Bracken’s tutelage was particularly crucial to the formation of a Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) chapter on campus. As SDS student leader John Livingston recalled, Bracken “always was kicking us in the ass [to motivate] us.”

Some of the earliest New Left activity at ASU concerned the Vietnam War, and Bracken was among the first members of the campus community—student or faculty—to openly criticize U.S. policy
Bracken directly linked higher education to the Vietnam War, explaining that the university's role in the national dialogue was just as misunderstood as the Vietnam situation. He took a direct and deliberate jab at ASU in his opening comments. "In a university worthy of the name," he suggested, "it would not be necessary to preface comments on Vietnam with comments on a university." Phoenicians clearly believed that the university should "mirror the society which pays its bill," which meant teaching conservative viewpoints that supported U.S. intervention in Vietnam, rather than providing an environment that nurtured debate about the consequences of, and reasons behind, the U.S. involvement. Bracken was concerned that ASU lagged behind other public institutions in addressing broad social issues. "So far, as I can determine, the greatest cerebral challenge ASU students have met with in the two years I have been here has been the question of seating at the basketball games," Bracken observed. "And the faculty seems to have been disturbed by football seating. Civil rights, our failure to provide high school educations to Arizona minority groups, the peace movement, free speech, Vietnam—these have passed us by."\(^{28}\)

Bracken's speech ignited a controversy over the right of faculty members to criticize U.S. policy on Vietnam and other issues. A week later, an Arizona State Senate committee that included members of the Arizona Board of Regents met with ASU president Durham and University of Arizona president Richard Harvill to discuss "possible disruptive activity on Arizona campuses," before distributing funds to the Arizona universities. Democratic State Senator Robert Hathaway asked President Durham if Bracken's speech was responsible for picketing of the Selective Service building in downtown Phoenix the previous Saturday. Durham responded by pointing out that the picket had been peaceful and reminded the senator that "about an equal number" of conservative Young Americans for Freedom (YAF) had counter-demonstrated. Given the agenda he had set for ASU during his 1960 convocation address, Durham was surprisingly supportive of Professor Bracken. He insisted that Bracken had followed university regulations, that the crowd was not disruptive, and that his speech had produced no negative consequences. Durham defended academic freedom (and hinted at his own political views) with a quote from Voltaire: "I do not agree with a word that you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it."\(^{29}\)
Later in May, Bracken helped ASU’s SDS chapter file a petition requesting official recognition as a campus organization. SDS had formed at ASU during the 1964–65 academic year, primarily around issues involving university policies that included academic freedom, the mandatory ROTC program, and guaranteed seating at intercollegiate athletic events. Once the petition was filed, contemporary rock ‘n’ roll radio station KRUX aired two editorials denouncing SDS as “an organization that has been associated with communist-controlled and dominated groups.” Bracken knew he would have trouble with the ASU administration, particularly the politically conservative dean of students, W. P. Shofsall, who opposed granting campus recognition to SDS because of its anti-administration views and because its “goals were contrary to the university[‘s].” Bracken suspected that much of his trouble would stem from his recent speech at the MU Ballroom, which KRUX characterized as “a one man teach-in on Vietnam.” The conservative press criticized President Durham for letting professors “brainwash students...on state property in institutions supported by the taxpayers.” The Evening American insisted that the real predicament was allowing a taxpayer-supported institution to criticize the U.S. war effort, thereby “aid[ing] the enemy.” For conservative Phoenicians, a speech delivered on state property, funded by taxpayer dollars, was a separate and distinct issue from free speech; state property, in their view, was actually private property belonging to the citizens of Arizona. Therefore, the constitutional right to freedom of speech was not applicable and professors and students had no right to criticize U.S. policy on Vietnam, nor express any other dissenting views. That fall, Bracken and ASU’s Philosophy Club organized a Vietnam teach-in to coincide with the International Days of Protest on October 15, 1965. One of the invited speakers was University of Minnesota political science professor Mulford Q. Sibley. Bracken alerted Sibley to the conservative environment at ASU and warned him that the administration dreaded the development of SDS as a campus organization. He also described a culture of fear among faculty members, pointing out that some professors had contributed to SDS “small amounts of cash in plain brown envelopes passed over bathroom partitions.”

News of the upcoming teach-in and Sibley’s scheduled appearance set off a firestorm among conservative newspapers and private citizens. The Phoenix American devoted a huge front-page headline to the teach-in, and denounced Sibley as an advocate of “Communist Clubs, Nudist Clubs and Free Love Clubs.” The American also reported (incorrectly) that Students for a Democratic Society was the primary sponsor of the event. Shortly thereafter, Marvin Galbreath of Phoenix’s First Free Methodist church wrote a letter to President Durham objecting to the “Vietnam sit-in activity” and Sibley’s presence at ASU. Galbreath’s confusion about the distinction between a teach-in and a sit-in indicates the degree to which the general public conflated different types of dissent and protest, condemning them all as disruptive and disobedient. While upholding the right to free speech, Galbreath asserted that the university, as a taxpayer-supported institution, should not invite speakers with a “questionable background of associations and whose ideals are repugnant to so many God-fearing parents.” He urged Durham to cancel Sibley’s invitation to “share his views with our children,” as they were contrary to the “ideals” of ASU. In doing so, Galbreath seemed to argue that the university should take a more paternal role in students’ lives and shield taxpayers’ “children,” as he termed college-age students, from alternative viewpoints and controversial figures. A well-rounded education based on debate and exposure to new ideas was clearly alien to his outlook.

Despite public pressure to cancel the teach-in, protesters and counter-protestors arrived on campus to hear the panel consisting of Sibley, University of California at Santa Barbara political science professor Raghavan Iyer, and retired Methodist minister W.A. McClennahan, who chaired the Phoenix Committee on Viet Nam. Supporters and critics frequently interrupted the speakers with applause and boos. Pro-war demonstrators carried signs into the Memorial Union that said, “Pravda Salutes Comrade Bracken” and “Better Dead than Red—Win in Vietnam.” Charles C. Polenick of the Scottsdale-based, anti-communist Save Our Schools Committee taped the speeches, which he denounced as “academic treason rather than academic freedom.”

Just days after the teach-in, Bracken received a letter from the executive council of the Associated Students of Arizona State University, informing him that the SDS application for official recognition had been denied. The letter explained that, “The Council was unanimous in its feeling that the purpose and goals of Students
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The Student Affairs Committee, nonetheless, upheld the original decision to deny a charter to SDS. President Durham concurred and rejected the petition on February 3, 1966. Furious over Durham's decision, Bracken wrote a letter arguing that the president had "acted in ways incompatible with his duties as chief administrative officer of this University," and asking ASU faculty members to protest. He accused Durham of supporting an "unjust system" that suppressed "free inquiry outside the classroom." A tear-off statement at the bottom of the letter declared:

We, the undersigned members of the faculty of Arizona State University, wish to protest your rejection of University recognition for a campus chapter of Students for a Democratic Society. As educators, we believe that the suppression of free discussion involved in your action is incompatible with the idea of a university.

Based on the responses, there appears to have been more faculty support for Durham's decision to withhold a campus charter from SDS than there was for Bracken's protest. Marketing professor William H. Harris wrote a vitriolic letter in which he informed Bracken that he would not sign the petition under any circumstances and suggested that SDS would be more appropriately termed "SCS," or Students for a Communistic Society. Harris accused Bracken of performing a "disservice to the students unfortunate enough to come under your influence when you serve as spokesman for this alien group." Leland Ax, a professor in the College of Engineering, accused Bracken of overstepping the boundaries of academic freedom and generating unfavorable publicity that could jeopardize funding from the legislature. If Bracken spent more time teaching, he might find that it is a "full-time job which would leave little time to devote to exploiting academic freedom." Physics professor Ernest Snyder was alarmed by SDS's stated objective to "wrest control of the educational process from the educational bureaucracy." Snyder believed that, contrary to Bracken's assertion that SDS's views should not be the issue, these views were the issue. To Snyder, "wresting control" of education meant that "SDS wants to take over and tell me what to do." Snyder considered himself part of the "administrative bureaucracy," and viewed SDS as a "threat" to his way of life.
From 780 faculty members, Bracken received only fifty signatures on his petition to reconsider Durham's decision.\(^50\) One of them was Morris Stansky, an assistant professor of philosophy, who compared the ban on SDS to "keeping Negroes out of public parks."\(^51\) Walter Gershenfeld, an associate professor of management, signed the petition and then wrote a letter to Durham, explaining that, while he thought many of SDS's positions were "downright foolishness," ASU was "engaged in the task of building a university of stature," which would be impossible if it could not provide a space for debate.\(^52\) Durham also received letters from faculty members who neither supported SDS and Bracken's petition, nor agreed with Durham's decision to deny SDS's charter. Wallace Adams, an associate professor of history, was unfamiliar with SDS and had refused to sign the petition because he disliked its wording. Nonetheless, he expressed to Durham his concern over the potential consequences for ASU—as a "center of higher learning"—if it barred SDS's presence on campus. How, Adams asked, was the university supposed to attract "bright, enthusiastic, and thoughtful social science professors who normally are committed to the process of free discussion and learning," if the administration continued to discourage free expression and dissent. For Adams, the university seemed to be equating "desirability" with "popularity," which he believed did not reflect well on either students or faculty. If ASU wanted to view itself as an institution of higher education, then "surely conformity and popularity and 'desirability' cannot be the mental image most academicians would agree on," he concluded.\(^53\)

Although criticizing the majority of ASU faculty members for their disinterest in academic freedom and their unwillingness to question administration decisions, Bracken nonetheless thanked the minority who had signed his petition.\(^54\) In an open letter, he explained that the fundamental issue at stake was the defense of free speech and free inquiry. As an ominous example, he recounted an incident from the previous week in which a university administrator allegedly interrogated Philosophy Department staff in an effort to identify the person who had typed the SDS petition. Bracken questioned the "dedication to freedom of an administration that engages in such practices." Nor was it the only incident. In October, a former FBI agent had attempted to obtain writing samples from the department's typewriters.\(^55\)

On March 2, 1966, Bracken submitted his resignation from the ASU faculty, effective the date his contract expired on June 30, 1966, to take a teaching position at McGill University in Montreal, Canada.\(^56\) In a letter to department head Robert Reinl, Bracken attributed part of his decision to "academic reasons," including the lack of research materials in his field of interest at the ASU library, but he also cited his fundamental disagreement "with the administration's concept of education and of what a university is." Given Bracken's issues with the ASU administration, the public outcry over his involvement with SDS and the antiwar movement, and his own comments, it is clear that negative reaction to his politics was the primary factor in his resignation. "[T]he crap [was] still flying" and the entire Philosophy Department was under attack for the October teach-in when he accepted the position at McGill.\(^57\) Bracken clearly felt that the public outcry and administration resistance encroached on his right to perform what he believed were essential duties of his job—encouraging students to think critically through vigorous debate, whether that debate took place in the classroom or through speeches and teach-ins. Jaded from his ASU experience, Bracken believed his only recourse was to accept a teaching position outside the United States.\(^58\) Personal reasons also motivated him to leave the country. Bracken was a father who did not want his son drafted into the Vietnam War.\(^59\)

In an article published near the close of the academic year, the Arizona Republic discussed the growing discontent among ASU faculty. Although there was no barometer to indicate the level of dissatisfaction, the newspaper pointed out that salaries were not the only issue. Some faculty members were unhappy with the "intellectual climate or with teaching conditions" at the university, complaining that large class sizes were diluting the quality of instruction and that communication between administration and faculty was poor. Others expressed concern that ASU was focusing more on vocational training than on "academic education." William Phillips, an assistant professor of history, felt that the administration and the Board of Regents had failed to educate the public about the proper role of the university. "[T]he idea loose in this community and in much of the West that the teacher is a mere employee of the administration or Board of Regents rather than a professor who operates independently," Phillips observed.
Morris Starsky added that “[a] segment of professors . . . feel they are being looked at as something like hired hands.” Even though they were being paid by the university, professors asserted the right to direct their research and curriculum as they saw fit, including their campus and community activities. This was the crux of academic freedom.

Morris Starsky
Raised in a “solidly pro-working class and union neighborhood,” Morris Starsky joined the ASU faculty in the fall of 1964, after serving on the faculty of the University of Michigan from 1958-1962 and the University of Washington from 1962-1964. Following Bracken’s departure, Starsky became a central New Left leader at ASU. He pushed the boundaries of academic freedom, and like Bracken, lost his job in the process. However, the circumstances surrounding Starsky’s exit were fraught with far more politics, including outright sabotage, than in Bracken’s case. Starsky not only filled the New Left leadership role that Bracken vacated, but he assumed Bracken’s place as a left-wing scapegoat. In the fall of 1966, the Arizona Committee for Responsible Education (ACRE) composed a letter to the Arizona Board of Regents demanding that the Regents address Starsky’s involvement with union protests and the New Left. ACRE asked if “Trotskyite Marxists . . . receive the same consideration at salary review time as those numerous faculty members who seem to be trying to serve the best interests of the State of Arizona?” A KRUX radio editorial in October 1967 similarly accused Starsky of “violating the academic freedom of the majority of the taxpayers of this state” when he spoke out against U.S. policy in Vietnam. KRUX asserted that taxpayers objected to paying a professor who approved of draft resistance, and therefore, lawbreaking. Starsky should have the right to say what he wanted, but he should not be able to do it on the backs of the “producing, productive people” who paid his salary. Nor should he be allowed to express radical sentiments on “tax-supported campuses.”

In the spring of 1967, Starsky delivered a speech entitled “Education in a Democratic Society” to students at Mesa Community College in which he criticized administrators for setting all the rules, which prevented students from assuming roles as leaders and decision-makers. Because they shared mutual concerns and were frequently pitted against administrators, students and faculty should form their own administrative organizations. Starsky asserted that education was too often directed toward members of the lower-middle class, who in his view tended to be “followers to authoritarianism,” rather than toward individuals who were capable of making choices. In the place of “truth, honest, integrity, scholarship, independence, creativity, beauty and humanity”—all concepts typically associated with a classical liberal arts education—contemporary universities emphasized “credits, grades, order, sameness and authority” that promoted “lower-middle class values of status, power, utility, selfishness, and the like.” In Starsky’s view, American
universities had become factories where the "skilled labor of the faculty" shaped students to enter a mass society in which a "power elite" made all the decisions.\(^{65}\)

Starsky's speech reflected a theory articulated by SDS leaders in the late 1960s that portrayed students as part of a new working class, "oppressed by a poverty of spirit" and dissatisfied with the impersonal nature of the university.\(^{66}\) Instead of encouraging "self-cultivation, self-direction, self-understanding, and creativity," ideas that Starsky and other New Left activists valued, universities focused on producing salaried managers and technicians whose jobs blurred the line between manual and intellectual labor.\(^{67}\) As employees of large bureaucratic institutions, these workers lacked the control "over their own means of livelihood" that was essential to motivate social action. Consequently, educated and salaried professionals such as teachers, social workers, lawyers, and doctors would have to play the principal role in organizing and providing "the unifying aspect of the new working class."\(^{68}\) Starsky's speech echoed the New Left critique of the university as what historian Douglas Rosinow refers to as a "tool of economic elites."\(^{69}\) It also underscored journalist David Boroff's sentiment in a 1965 article entitled "A Plea to Save the Liberal Arts," in which Boroff warned that an emphasis on science and technology in education, at the expense of the liberal arts, would "produce[e] a generation of mindless technicians, specialized boors or even sinister Dr. Strangeloves" who took advantage of workers schooled in conformity and submission to authority.\(^{70}\)

Starsky's New Left activities prompted his peers on the Faculty Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure to charge him, in the spring of 1970, with unprofessional conduct and disregard of university regulations. One of the charges alleged that he had "failed to observe university regulations" when he cancelled class on January 14 to speak to students at the University of Arizona in support of eight students who had been arrested for their involvement in a riot. Starsky countered that he had scheduled the class cancellation in advance with his dean and department head, and that his address on the UA campus was an exercise of free speech. The committee further alleged that Starsky had "incited, urged and encouraged" ASU students, and persons not affiliated with the university, to occupy the president's office during a protest against unfair labor practices at a Phoenix linen company. In doing so, his actions had undermined the peace and concord between Arizona State University and the surrounding community.\(^{71}\) Starsky denied that he had spoken at the rally that preceded the sit-in and expressed his belief that the occupation was lawful because no one had ordered the protesters to leave the administration building. In an apparent attempt to defend the sit-in as peaceful and justifiable, he noted the presence of clergy and of other faculty members. Perhaps most telling, the committee alleged that Starsky, himself, had failed to meet his obligation "to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom" and that his actions had "subjected Arizona State University to unwarranted censure which has had an adverse effect upon the economic ability of Arizona State University to provide properly for the educational needs of the people of Arizona."\(^{72}\)

A faculty committee headed by Marcus Whiffen (who had signed Bracken's earlier petition) and Sherri Finkbine defended Starsky, blasting the state legislature's call for an investigation of Starsky's attendance at the Tucson rally as "an attempt to return Arizona to the dark ages of McCarthyism." The committee praised Starsky's involvement in the anti-war movement and his support for black, white, and Chicano student group demands for university reform. In its view, Starsky was being persecuted for his political views as the faculty advisor for the Young Socialist Alliance (YSA) and the "common knowledge in Arizona" that he identified himself as a Trotskyist.\(^{73}\)

The possibility of Starsky's dismissal from the ASU faculty prompted the local press to address tenure and the question of whether or not Starsky had a "right" to his job. The Phoenix Gazette pointed out that state law provided tenure—a process by which a person became a permanent employee who could only be fired after official proceeding involving formal charges and hearings—solely to elementary and secondary school teachers; university teachers, on the other hand, were hired and retained on a year-to-year basis. In fact, ASU during this period had adopted an informal process through which, after three years, a professor was considered a permanent employee who would be reappointed until retirement or disability. A qualifying clause stipulated that the individual's performance must remain satisfactory in order to be considered for retention.\(^{74}\)

[386]
Although the Faculty Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure recommended that Starsky retain his job, the Arizona Board of Regents directed his dismissal and Starsky was gone from the ASU campus by the close of the academic year in the late spring of 1970. The Regents also asked Thomas Hoult, a Starsky supporter and the head of Starsky's defense committee, to resign as chair of the sociology department. In the context of the carnage at Kent State University and Jackson State University in May, it is not surprising that Starsky lost his job, especially in light of the accusations that he was "inciting" students to occupy administration buildings.

In early 1975, Starsky and his lawyer, Allan Kayman, released documents obtained through the Freedom of Information Act that showed the FBI had intentionally set him up to be fired. The first documents from the FBI's counterintelligence program, or COINTELPRO, released to the public, and still censored in some areas, showed that as early as May 1968 the Bureau had explicitly pinpointed Starsky and the ASU Philosophy Department as instigators of the New Left movement in Phoenix. According to one FBI report, "It is apparent that New Left organizations and activities in the Phoenix metropolitan area have received their inspiration and leadership almost exclusively from the members of the faculty in the Dept. of Philosophy at Arizona State University, chiefly Assistant Prof. Morris J. Starsky. The most logical targets for potential counterintelligence action locally are therefore pretty obvious." Anticipating that "Starsky's dismissal from the ASU faculty" would "disrupt New Left organizations at Arizona State University and in the Phoenix area generally," the FBI suggested that "falsified attendance records or something of that nature" might serve as grounds for his firing. The FBI took advantage of the Faculty Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure investigation to send an anonymous letter, signed by "a concerned ASU alumnus," alerting committee members to a dispute between Starsky and YSA member David Murphy that had resulted in police intervention.

After the documents were released, Starsky took his case to federal court, where a Phoenix judge ruled he had been illegally fired and awarded him a $15,000 settlement. The trial revealed that FBI director J. Edgar Hoover and his agents had intended to use Starsky "as a lesson to left-wing profs at ASU and around the country." In a 1989 article eulogizing Starsky after his death at the age of fifty-five, the Phoenix New Times noted that his case remained a "lesson to all Arizona State faculty members that conformity is the prudent course to adopt for those who prefer to eat regularly and keep up their car payments."

Conclusion

Harry Bracken and Morris Starsky provided the intellectual authority for the New Left on the Arizona State University campus in the late 1960s and early 1970s, while addressing concerns about
the proper role of a university in the larger community, freedom of speech on campus, and the right of faculty members to direct their own work. A public hostile to the notion of using its tax dollars to fund "Communist" professors and left-wing student organizations reacted by asserting ownership of the university and pressuring the administration to stifle dissent and speech it deemed offensive, inappropriate, or in some cases, treasonous. Negative reactions to Bracken's political views, and what he viewed as encroachments on his academic freedom, prompted him to leave ASU. Starsky, on the other hand, was deliberately sabotaged by the FBI and dismissed from the faculty because of his ideology and political activities.

C. Wright Mills, regarded as the premiere influence on New Left ideology, believed that students and intellectuals were the "possible, immediate, radical agency of change." According to Mills, the "young intelligentsia," and not the working class, were the natural leaders of radical movements. In the 1960s and '70s, a new working class was taking shape on university campuses. Students and faculty members argued that they should have more control over university affairs, because they were the ones who were producing the knowledge that would sustain the growth of an increasingly technological and service-oriented economy. Understanding academic freedom as a labor issue paints a more complicated picture of the university as both an employer and a provider of the resources necessary for self-directed academic research. The debates that Bracken and Starsky instigated with the public and with university administration about what constituted acceptable faculty behavior raises questions about how to define the university. Is it a workplace? Or is it an intermediate zone in which faculty members are not quite workers, but are also not quite part of the power elite?

Prior to a faculty meeting in 1968, Starsky distributed a flyer that contained LeRoi Jones's phrase, "Up against the wall, motherf---r." This incident was included in the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee's charges against him. Starsky's argument that the committee's attempt to discipline him threatened his "constitutional right of free speech" raises questions about how constitutional rights apply in the workplace. Is passing out information containing belligerent language more acceptable in the university than it would be in an office or factory? How do distinctions between public and private employers complicate understandings of a constitutional right to free speech in the workplace? Academic freedom allows students and professors to act as agents of debate and free inquiry, and to push the limits of what conventional standards consider acceptable. Blue- and white-collar workers, on the other hand, are confined by police that limit and control their behavior and words in the workplace. To this extent, the universities provide a "space of contention," where thoughts and ideas are freely exchanged. Conflict arose at ASU and other universities across the country when the New Left demanded a voice in policymaking and freedom of expression in an arena that insisted on conformity.

NOTES


3. The phrase "intellectual authority" is borrowed from Rossnow, Politics of Authenticity.


5. Philip VanderMeer, Desert Visions and the Making of Phoenix, 1870-2009 (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2010), p. 17. VanderMeer asserts there was only an "ancient Indian connection," indicating that Indians were not living in the Phoenix area at the time of Anglo settlement.

6. Ibid., p. 22.

7. Ibid., p. 64.
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Brecken to Petition Signatories, February 15, 1966, folder 5, box 1, HBP. Soon after the October 1966 teach-in, a campus security officer, formerly of the FBI, took samples from typewriters in the Philosophy Department. Brecken suspected this meant the Board of Regents would "be pressured into taking a stand in favor of a more rigorous speaker policy." Brecken to Mullford Sibley, October 21, 1965, folder 19, box 1, ibid.
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Brecken recalled, "I often think fondly of ASU--of the friends we knew, of the climate, of the mountains. But to build a university in Tempe, given the immorality actively encouraged by men like Durham, seems logically absurd." Brecken to Morris Starks, November 21, 1966, folder 19, box 1, HBP. Brecken's time at McGill was not without controversy either. In reference to the administration at McGill, he wrote that "it took me a long while to realize that those same idiots that populate the Arizona scene are up here... . I have been denounced by the graduate dean in language no one in Tempe would have dared use!" Brecken to Starks, March 4, 1959, ibid.


Faculty Unrest Growing at ASU," Arizona Republic, May 22, 1966, folder 5, box 3, HBP.
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RESCUING JEROME FROM ITS GHOSTS
by Diane Sward Rapaport

FROM ONE WINDOW of the apartment I lived in during the spring of 2012, Jerome looked like a quaint, model-train village: colorful little boxes capped by triangular roofs, stacked and inset into two steep, burnt sienna, pyramid-shaped hills. Plum, apricot, and almond trees were in full bloom and hundreds of tree branches showed a blush of chartreuse. From another window, breaks in a great cloudscape formed an abstract shadow play on the floor of the Verde Valley 1,700 feet below. The sun spotlighted canyon buttes across the valley and turned them vivid shades of carmine.

It was a different story when I walked a mile uphill through the back streets to the post office at the top of town. Bedlam reigned. Throngs of people crowded the street. The bump and grind of cars, trucks, and motorcycles clashed with the rock-and-roll music bellowing out of one of the bars. The views were still spectacular, but it was not so pleasant to become immersed in them.

Tourism had become Jerome’s new gold rush: a million and a half visitors a year now come to shop, party in the bars, gawk at the views, and hear tales of bordello and ghosts. The only ruin still remaining on Main Street is the shell of the Bartlett Hotel.

© 2012 Diane Rapaport. The author holds a master's degree in Renaissance literature and history from Cornell University. She is a published writer, editor, and publisher with expertise in the music business, environmental and groundwater remediation, and Taoist health practices. This article is adapted from Home Sweet Jerome, her memoir of life in Jerome after the copper mines closed in the early 1950s. The book will be published by Johnson Books, a subsidiary of Big Earth Publishing, in late 2013.