

"THE STUDENTS ARE REBELLING IN OUR UNIVERSITIES. THERE IS TURMOIL IN THE CITIES.. THE COMMUNISTS THREATEN US BOTH HERE AND ABROAD. WE NEED LAW AND ORDER, LAW AND ORDER-- . ELECT US AND WE WILL HAVE LAW AND ORDER. DO NOT ELECT US AND THE REPUBLIC IS DOOMED."

ADOLF HITLER, 1932.

We've been talking a lot the past few days about police, nazis, fascism, and repression in general. Dr. Spock's speech, coming right after the firing of Dr. Garskof, gives a focus for this talk.

No--This is not Nazi Germany. Not yet, anyway. We are still able to move around fairly freely and talk with each other. The time may come when we cannot even talk, but repression is very real even now. Spock and the others have been convicted of counselling people not to enter a war that is ruining not only Vietnam, but this country as well. All over this country and around the world, soldiers are deserting and being court-martialled at a higher rate than ever before. Police forces have been strengthened, riot squads are doubled and tripled, and hundreds of radicals, professors, etc. are suddenly out of jobs as junior HUAC's spring up. We are building for another 1954 Red Scare, where anti-communism was the focus for quieting dissent. As in "democracy" everywhere, we are offered not democracy, but anti-communism.

Repression is Nixon's Unity through Law and Order. It is unity by systematically destroying any person or force that does not fit the mold that we are given.

The people who run this country--the ruling class, power elite, whatever they are called--will attempt to contain us as they have thus far over Garskof. Run us around, talk about prerogatives and channels, and hope we will forget the issue. At the same time, when they realize we are serious, as they did when we added the second demand for open admissions of all Black, Third World, and white working class people, they are prepared to smash us with whatever force necessary.

Even in Germany, repression did not directly affect the majority of the people. Repression falls on those who disagree, who are trying to change the status quo and improve our society. So it is a question of strength, of solidarity. In a just cause, there is no middle ground, you must be on one side or the other. It was only through the inaction of the majority that 6,000,000 people were quietly slaughtered.

Our demands are just--Re-instate Dr. Bert Garskof, and that the university open its doors to Black, Third World, and white working class people. We will picket Hannah's State of the University speech Monday night to re-state our demands--we will fight until we win. Join us!--

Friday--Wilson Aud.--3:00--Dr. Spock
Main Aud.---4:15--Dr. Spock (757)
Ad. Bldg.---5:35--quick rally
Leaflet & talk to A.D.S. applicants
in Holmes--Dinner & after.

Saturday--MC-5 Concert--Leafletting at Ballroom

Sunday---7:00, 7:30--form complex meetings.

MONDAY--Ad. Bldg.--2:00--Rally, de-centralized picketing.

FAIRCHILD THEATRE--7:30--STATE OF THE UNIVERSITY, TEACHER OF THE YEAR AWARD.
MASS PICKETS.

Movement Centers:
Brody--A210 Butterfield
355-1312
East--1272 Hubbard
353-8454
W. Circle--134 Campbell
355-0013
South--556 S. Case
355-6921
N.E.--214 Snyder
355-9401
Off-Campus--146 Haslett
351-3490

DARE TO STRUGGLE, DARE TO WIN!

Few people associated with Michigan State University remain unaware of the now celebrated case of Bertram Garskof, assistant professor of psychology, whose dismissal by a unilateral action of Dean Winder has set in motion a complex of actions and reactions. We, the undersigned faculty, staff, and other members of the university community, believe that the Garskof case presents a serious challenge to the fundamental concept of the University as a free institution of inquiry and higher learning.

On Wednesday evening, February 12, the American Association of University Professors held an open meeting to establish the facts of this case. Since there were only about a hundred members of the MSU community present, we would like to share our views and concern with the community at large.

We believe the following points were established as facts at the AAUP meeting. These facts, provided by either the Chairman Lawrence I. O'Kelly of the Psychology Department, or Professor Garskof, were contested by neither of the two principals. (Dean Winder too was invited but refused to appear before the meeting, and was reported as saying that he preferred only a legal confrontation.)

1. The Psychology Department, resisting strong pressures from higher up, recommended and twice reaffirmed a two year contract extension for Professor Garskof. Eventually it was approved by the Dean, the Provost, and the Board of Trustees.
2. Between November 25 and 27, 1968, Chairman O'Kelly and Professor Garskof exchanged three letters resulting in an agreement to this effect: Garskof would accept the two-year offer if he could not find a more satisfactory position, and that he would inform the Chairman of his decision by the end of the Spring meetings of the Midwest Psychological Association.
3. On January 27, Dean Winder called Dr. O'Kelly to let him know that he was withdrawing the offer to Garskof. This decision was taken without

prior consultation with the Chairman or the faculty of the Department of Psychology. Even the Chairman and Professor Garskof had been given no reasons for the Dean's action as of the evening of February 12.

4. The Dean has consistently refused to make known the reasons for his action, even when he appeared before a closed session of the faculty of the Psychology department.
5. Chairman O'Kelly told the AAUP meeting that the action was the sole doing of the Dean, and that he contradicted the written and twice reaffirmed will of the Psychology department by his abrupt withdrawal of the offer.
6. The Psychology department has found no complaint in Garskof's record as a researcher or in his promise for the future. (Since receiving his doctorate in 1963, he has published 4 to 6 papers a year in professional psychological journals.) As a teacher Dr. Garskof consistently received high ratings and was commended by his Chairman as an "innovative and effective teacher."
7. The only area of formal difficulty was his handling of Psychology 490 (large enrollments and blanket "A's"). However, such practice was not a new thing, even in the Psychology department, and the matter was being adjudicated through normal departmental channels at the time Dean Sinder unilaterally cancelled the offer.

The Dean's action is surrounded by extraordinary circumstances. Apparently he had his reasons but he has been noticeably reticent to disclose them. Since the AAUP meeting, Garskof has expressed his willingness to make the facts public. In our judgment, the manner in which the Dean has acted and his subsequent reluctance to discuss the matter publicly further strengthen the concern that the abrupt withdrawal of the offer was motivated by non-academic considerations.

We would not like to see this matter resolved by the forces of action and reaction. We consider that the unilateral withdrawal of a written offer

without warning constitutes unfair treatment of a member of our scholarly community. We strongly urge the administration to reconsider its decision.

Signature

Position and Department

Name (please print)

MALDEN

MEMORIAL

8:00 THURS

CONVOY

DISCUSS Where We

GO NEXT

to Re-instate Bert Gaskot

upon a mission at MSU

Winter 69 - Gaskot

ON GASKOF'S FIRING: AN ANALYSIS

Almost a week ago, one of our professors was fired by the Administration. Bert Garskof, who taught Psychology 151 and Psychology 490, received notice that an offer for a two-year contract (off the tenure track) had been revoked. His connections with HSU are to be severed at the end of spring term.

For many of us, Dr. Garskof was more than just another professor. His psychology classes stood in sharp contrast to the rest of our courses. We enrolled in them seeking an alternative to classes swollen beyond reason, to course material irrelevant to our own needs, and from cut-throat competition for grades.

The University

Professor Garskof was fired from the university, a university where the official rhetoric speaks of "developing the free, autonomous, creative and responsible individual--the citizen in the best sense of the word." The number of students still believing in such things after their second week is indicative of the emptiness of such rhetoric.

Despite official lip-service to individual development, we find the day-to-day practices largely authoritarian, conformist, and status-quo oriented. Students are forced to compete against one another for grades. The relation between student and professor is one of dominance and subordination. The course material itself is often dishonest rationalizations for the status-quo. Rather than the development of our creativity and ability to think we are forced to memorize a hodge-podge of facts and specialize our knowledge to the point of irrelevancy.

It is not an accident our education is like this. The education we get is to serve interests other than our own. President Hannah, in 1962, said: "Our colleges and universities must be regarded as bastions of defense, as essential to the preservation of our country and our way of life as super-sonic bombers, nuclear-powered submarines, and intercontinental ballistic missiles." Who defines 'our country' and 'our way of life'? Certainly not us, nor even most people. Another quote from President Hannah is equally enlightening: "I believe the primary and secondary schools can make education serve the individual and national interest in preparing youngsters for military service and life under conditions of stress as well as preparing them for college, or for a job or profession. I would not even shrink from the word 'indoctrination' to describe the kind of education I have in mind."

From President Hannah's statements we can begin to see that the university has some function quite different from what might be best for the students. In fact he openly admits the purpose of education is to serve something he calls "national interest" in order to preserve "our way of life". How does President Hannah define his terms? The reality of our society defines what he really means.

Although in America there are over 180,000 corporations, the 5 largest make 20% of all net profits. The 500 largest make 73% of all net profits and employ directly 13,000,000 workers. A tiny 1.6% of the American people own 1/3 of the nation's wealth. As our economy becomes more centralized so does power; a select few men and major corporations hold most of the power in our society. It is they who control production, raw materials, new technology and social wealth. The means of influence and communication are also in their hands; all three major television networks are controlled by defense contractors. Politicians depend upon the corporations to finance their political campaigns, and cabinet officials are made government advisors, and different advisory 'councils' to the president are made up primarily of businessmen. Social goals, national

priorities, and national security are all defined by the major corporations. It is in this social context the University exists, and these corporate interests the University serves.

Through donations, grants, foundations, and government research the University is directly shaped by corporate needs: to train skilled workers and to do corporate and military research. The drive for foreign markets is also an important corporate drive. Michigan State has a huge international studies program helping preserve and extend American influence abroad, thus helping protect foreign markets. Michigan State also performs the role of training manpower for corporate slots by giving students meaningless, boring, and alienating work. For as capitalist society has advanced work roles have become increasingly specialized, compartmentalized, meaningless, and alienating. The kind of people thus required must be prepared to accept such roles. We are trained and socialized: not educated. For our society requires apathetic, atomized, and unthinking people. It seems logical to find that our training is reflective of our future.

Professor Garskof attempted to serve the students in teaching them to think, to be creative and the challenge of their ideas. But in failing to "indoctrinate" students he was not fulfilling the kind of job that President Hannah and the interests he represents want done; and so he was fired.

Our Demands

WE DEMAND THAT PROFESSOR GARSKOF BE IMMEDIATELY REINSTATED AND GIVEN FULL TENURE AND PRIVILEGES AS A PROFESSOR AT THIS UNIVERSITY. Our struggles for his reinstatement will continue until the demand is satisfied; for we will defend ourselves against the ever-increasing control, manipulation and power the Administration has over our lives.

MSU-SDS
Students for a
Democratic Society.

RALLY RALLY RALLY RALLY RALLY RALLY RALLY RALLY RALLY RALLY RALLY RALLY RALLY RALLY RALLY RALLY

FIGHT POLITICAL REPRESSION

SDS-MMA

WE DEMAND THAT BERT GASKOF BE IMMEDIATELY RE-HIRED, WITH TENURE AND FULL PRIVILEGES OF A PROFESSOR, INCLUDING 490 AND 151 AS BEFORE, AND WITHOUT ADVISORY COMMITTEES OR OTHER DELAYING TACTICS:

This demand must be met by Monday, February 3, 1969, at 2:00 p.m., when we will assemble in Paul Schiff Plaza in front of the new Administration Building to hear the Administration's answer.

- | | |
|-----|-----|
| 1. | 21. |
| 2. | 22. |
| 3. | 23. |
| 4. | 24. |
| 5. | 25. |
| 6. | 26. |
| 7. | 27. |
| 8. | 28. |
| 9. | 29. |
| 10. | 30. |
| 11. | 31. |
| 12. | 32. |
| 13. | 33. |
| 14. | 34. |
| 15. | 35. |
| 16. | 36. |
| 17. | 37. |
| 18. | 38. |
| 19. | 39. |
| 20. | 40. |

RALLY

FIGHT POLITICAL REPRESSION
REINSTATE GARSKOP

monday
2:00

new ad. budding



DARE
TO WIN!

Last night the sounds of the real state of the university invaded Fairchild Theater as John Hannah delivered his annual State of the University Address to 600 MSU faculty members and 60 campus and state police in riot gear.

In the past, John Hannah's Address has been held in the main Auditorium and anyone who wanted to listen was admitted. But this year, it was by invitation only, so the students were forced to deliver a Counter-State of the University Address. Cops were stationed in the lobby of Fairchild and only a couple of us were allowed in. His speech was filled with the usual cliches about the landgrant university serving the interests of the people, but this timeless ritual failed to lull the audience into benign acceptance. Those of us outside decided that the state of the university should not go unchallenged, that the issues that face us demand immediate attention. Those issues are clear: in the present context they demand the re-hiring with tenure of Bert Garskof and open enrollment for Black, Third World, and white working class people. How do we respond to those demands? We act to further their realization. How does John Hannah speak to these issues? In his address he said the University must be "scrupulously honest" in its admissions procedures for Blacks and the "underprivileged": that MSU cannot just increase its quota of "disadvantaged" students if to do so would be to sacrifice the academic integrity of the institution. In other words, in a few sentences buried in a 90-minute speech: NO OPEN ADMISSIONS. On the question of Bert Garskof's firing, Hannah said there exists a "small coterie of people who attack and use the University," and that these people are seeking to destroy our political system. He re-iterated that the goal of the faculty is the "everlasting search for truth" and charged that people who overemphasize the goal of academic freedom are defending un-objectivity by faculty, which inhibits the search for truth. In short, Bert Garskof's political philosophy threatens his "objectivity" in the field of psychology because it demands that even there he challenge the status quo. Dissent is incompatible with objectivity and does not belong in the university community. In other words, BERT'S OUT.

Further, "students should be invited to participate in decisions about the tenure of faculty" only if they do not violate "the basic principles of this institution: truth, honor and integrity". Anything else leads to "confusion, disruption, destruction, chaos" or even worse "student demands, ultimatums, protests; the sit-downs, and sit-ins, love-ins, and 'do-your-own-thing'."

Meanwhile, outside, we had regrouped from the picket lines which were designed to allow the faculty admittance to the auditorium, and were holding a rally on the steps. During one of the raps there, one of us got mad at some hecklers and smashed into them. More fights broke out and the police arrested two demonstrators, one of whom was hauled into the lobby and beat up while the cops watched (and later put in a few kicks of their own). Another injury was a demonstrator who suffered a broken hip after being hit by a car and had to wait over an hour for an ambulance. After the fights ended, we decided that if we weren't coming in, the audience wasn't coming out, so we blocked off the main entrances, realizing that the faculty could leave through side doors, but making it clear that a planned reception for the Distinguished Faculty Award recipients in the Art Gallery would be cancelled due to the absence of nominee Bert Garskof, who we gave an award of our own later.

Later about 150 of the original crowd of 600 took Olds Hall for awhile, but decided to go back to the dorms and organize support for the rally today at the new Administration Building. Today at the rally, there will be an open discussion about where we are going and how to get there. One topic of discussion will be the broadening of the Steering Committee by elections in the complexes to be held tonight or tomorrow. So lots of things should happen today, and we should all be there to help decide what actions to take next. This isn't our university yet--We've got to MAKE it ours.

Winter 69 - SDS

ACTION

FRIDAY MORNING

10-AM, KELLOG CENTER

CONFRONT

THE

TRUSTEES

WITH OUR

JUST

DEMANDS

REHIRE GARSKOF

OPEN THE UNIVERSITY

REMEMBER

NEW UNIVERSITIES CONFERENCE / MSU

and

LUIS KAMPF

of MIT

and

BERT GARSKOF

109 Anthony 7 pm

FREE

April 14 1969

FREE

Continued from page 4

those articles, and should I not find one, you may add my name to that cancellation list.

RICHARD WARD, '72
MILWAUKEE

Editor's Note: Ours is not a "nolo-offendium" editorial policy (a check of recent letters to the editor will substantiate this). But, yes, despite the flaws, we do, indeed, think State is great. We do appreciate your expression of concern.

Larowe challenges Carlin on Sixties story

TO THE EDITOR:

As one who was actively involved as a participant in many of the events described in "The Sixties at MSU" (MSU ALUMNI MAGAZINE, January), I read the article with great interest. In fact, I complimented Bob Bao when I saw him at a luncheon for the fine job he and his colleague did on the piece.

MOVING?

Please Notify Us
6 Weeks In Advance

To change or correct your address
ATTACH LABEL HERE
from your latest issue

To change or correct your address, please send this form to:

MSU
Alumni
Magazine
P.O. Box 551
East Lansing,
Mich. 48823

Name _____ (please print)
New Address _____
City _____
State _____ Zip _____

I have just now read Dean Carlin's letter to the editor "The Sixties: More than meets the eye" in the March issue.

I could scarcely disagree more than I do with Dean Carlin's criticisms of Bao's and Pat Grauer's reporting. Indeed, at the risk of being too harsh on the dean, his complaint that they were inaccurate in their reporting of the university's handling of the Schiff, Garskof, and the Orange Horse 3 cases reminded me of another administration's initial reaction to the work of two investigative reporters who blew the whistle on administrative arrogance and obscurantism in Washington.

What happened in the Schiff case was exactly as Bao and Grauer reported. Paul was denied readmission because the university administration, of which the dean was a participant, decided Schiff was a troublemaker.

I have a vivid memory of asking then Provost Neville why Paul had been expelled and being told, in the bureaucratese that afflicts MSU administrators:

"What you don't understand, Larowe, is that MSU never *expels* a student. We only *suspend* them."

"How long does the suspension last?" I asked, chastened that I had fallen into error.

"Until the student proves that he has been rehabilitated and is qualified to come back," the provost answered.

That sounded to me like a lawyer's distinction without a difference. That was the way it struck the federal court, too, which ordered MSU to grant Schiff due process before it suspended him. The outcome was his readmission and the Academic Freedom Report—a tacit admission by MSU that it had wronged Schiff.

The dean also accuses Bao and Grauer of inaccuracy in their reporting of the case of the Orange Horse 3—Fogarty, Groat and Lawless. He denies that they were fired, using the euphemism that they were only "not reappointed". He then describes how he faithfully processed the papers and sent them on up to the Board of Trustees, who took the action not to reappoint them. Most of us, when we're told that our services are no longer wanted, infer that we're fired, no matter how delicately it's put by the bearer of the news that we're no longer on the payroll.

What the dean forgets to mention also, is that at the time of the Orange Horse 3, a non-tenured faculty member could be fired without being told why, and he or she had no right of appeal. That was why, at the time, I protested their firing.

The result of the Orange Horse 3, Garskof, and the more recent Van Tassel cases is that we now have a grievance procedure for non-tenured faculty, a non-tenured faculty member who is being fired has right to be given reasons in writing, and to a proper hearing which meets the requirements of due process.

All of this, I should add, was forced on the faculty and the administration by the Board of Trustees, who had to drag MSU's academic community kicking and screaming into the contemporary concept of what the Bill Of Rights means as a protection of the individual against arbitrary treatment by people in authority, no matter how well meaning.

If I may add a note to your editorial comment at the end of the dean's letter, my appreciation of Bao and Grauer as investigative reporters has increased considerably.

CHARLES P. LAROWE
MSU PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS

MSU DEVELOPMENT FUND STAFF

Arthur F. Loub, '52 (Duke)
Managing Director
Charles W. McCallum, '63
Director, Annual Giving
Terry Braverman, '60
Director, Ralph Young Fund
Robert W. Schneider, '51
(Manhattan College)
Director, Special Projects

DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

Officers

Glen Moore, '46, Chairman
Thomas Lenderink, '64, Vice Chairman
Arthur F. Loub, Executive Secretary

Terms Expire 1974:

William J. Bakke, '16, Midland, Michigan
Eli Broad, '54, Los Angeles, California
Norman J. Ellis, '35, Birmingham, Michigan
Lawrence Frymire, '44, Trenton, New Jersey
Clare F. Jarecki, '33, Grand Rapids, Michigan
Athanasios (Tony) J. Pasani, '48, Lansing, Mich.
Hazen M. Stevens, '42, Atlanta, Georgia
Richard Kram, '51, Flint, Michigan
Monte Story, '53, Okemos, Mich.

Terms Expire 1975:

Harry L. "Bud" Conrad, '46, Lansing, Michigan
Raymond A. Daelt, '50, Indianapolis, Indiana
Mrs. Karen Chaboussch Hiltzman, '63,
Muskegon, Michigan
Joseph Keegan, '66, Detroit, Michigan
Roger Matthews, '51, Grand Rapids, Michigan
Glen Moore, '46, George Pointe, Michigan
John D. Shingleton, '48, East Lansing, Mich.
Alvin Wingerter, D.V.M., '37, Big Rapids, Mich.
Horace Walker, '62, M.A. '63, Columbus, Ind.

Terms Expire 1976:

Charles Davey, '49, Birmingham, Mich.
Edgar Harden, Lansing, Mich.
Charles E. Kirsch, Sturgis, Mich.
Thomas Lenderink, '64, Belmont, Mich.
George Pachowski, '38, Mt. Kisco, N.Y.
John Podesta, '51, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Charles Roy, '53, Elm Grove, Wis.
Al Seelye, Grand Rapids, Mich.
Marion Garwell Shertzer, '53, Flat Rock, Mich.

Terms Expire 1977:

Donald A. Bergeson, '68, Birmingham, Mich.
Robert Emerson, '47, Okemos, Mich.
Robert B. Hughes, '58, East Lansing, Mich.
Pat Kostelshak, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Archie M. Long, '66, Bloomfield Hills, Mich.
Eugene S. Machus, '32, Birmingham, Mich.
David C. Marks, Grand Lodge, Mich.
Joan Secchia, '54, Grand Rapids, Mich.
Eugene Washington, '68, Edina, Minn.

Ex-Officio Members:

Lester W. Scott, '35, Vice President
Development, MSU
Jack Kinney, '58, Executive Director,
MSU Alumni Association

What does racism mean?

Racism does not just mean the attitudes and myths of racial inferiority, the racist attitudes so often bemoaned by pious liberals. It means the tremendous suffering, the complete physical degradation of millions of Americans who are herded into ghettos, paid inhuman wages when they can get a job at all, forced to live in dirty overcrowded rat traps. It means prostitution, selling your body to eat; it means drug addiction, poisoning yourself with junk to escape momentarily from a hopeless existence. It means being forced to pay for wars fought to protect the interests of the very people who are oppressing you and being forced to die in Vietnam fighting people like you who are trying to end conditions of exploitation and oppression in their country. It means systematic exclusion from educational institutions such as MSU which you have paid for, but cannot enter.

Where does racism come from?

Racism has a historical basis in America derived from the necessity to justify the forcible seizure and enslavement of African people. The ideology of racism was used not only to justify slavery, but to justify the continued exploitation of black people in the generations after the Civil War, an exploitation which continues today. However, the continuation of racism today cannot be explained merely on the basis of historical forces. If this were true why have the thousands of sociological studies, the dominant liberal rhetoric, the sincere efforts of thousands of reformers had so little effect? Why are more black children attending segregated schools today than in 1954, why are the real wages of black people lower today than 10 years ago? ¹

Racism today has a material basis in the exploitation of black people just as racism had a basis in their enslavement. The superexploitation of black people today means an extra \$22 billion annually in surplus profits from the wage differential between blacks and whites. Moreover the position of black people as a vast surplus labor pool (with lower wages and high unemployment rates) forces down the wage level of everybody, thus providing an additional source of profits. The high rents and high food prices, the prostitution and drug rackets in the ghettos are an additional source of tremendous profits.

Attacks on racist myths and prejudices not only fail to deal with the real physical problems of black people, but are bound to fail as long as racism has a powerful basis within the economic system. Such attacks lead only to paternalistic and selfrighteous attitudes, to the feelings that you are superior because you're not a racist. As long as black people are exploited and forced into a position of inferior status, racist myths of inferiority will continue to have credibility.

¹ Hamilton and Carmichael - Black Power

Who profits from racism?

Obviously most people in America have little to gain from racism. White workers may make minor gains such as preference in hiring, seniority, etc, but the effect of racism in keeping their wages down, its use to break strikes, weaken unions, and prevent working class unity in the long run far outweighs any advantages. Who then does benefit from racism? Who gets the \$22 billion in surplus profits made from the superexploitation of blacks? Who profits from the ghetto? In whose interest is the war in Vietnam being fought?

The same people profit from racism that profit from the labor of white workers, that control the educational institutions, the press, the political parties. They are the 0.2% of the population who own over 20% of the total national wealth and 65% of all publicly held stock.² They are the corporation presidents, the newspaper publishers, the political bosses, the university trustees. Example: David Rockefeller--President Chase Manhattan Bank (assets \$12.8 billion), trustee Columbia University, director Rockefeller Foundation. Example Arthur Sulzberger--publisher New York Times, trustee Columbia U. Example Henry Ford II- Trustee Ford Foundation, director Ford Motor Company, director General Electric, director General Foods, director Philco. Example John Hannah--director Michigan Bell Telephone, director American Bank and Trust, President Michigan State University, director AID, chairman U.S. Civil Rights Commission.

Racism serves these people. It serves them directly because of its tremendous profitability. It serves them indirectly as a powerful divisive force, a means of providing scapegoats, a way to keep the people fighting each other, rather than them.

How can racism be fought?

The only way that we can effectively fight racism is to attack the sources, the basis of racism within the system. This means we must support ghetto uprisings, support strikes aimed at better wages for both blacks and whites, support demands for community control of schools so that ghetto children can learn something relevant rather than racist lies. This means that as students at this university we must force the university to begin to serve the needs of the people, all of the people, the people who pay most of the taxes to support the university. We must force the university to alter the curriculum to teach action and change and movement. We must support people like Carskof who try to do that. And we must force the university to open its doors to people who don't come from privileged backgrounds, who haven't gone to the best schools the people who work the hardest and get the least in return.

REHIRE CARSKOF

OPEN ADMISSIONS FOR BLACK, THIRD WORLD, AND

WHITE WORKING CLASS PEOPLE

BOYCOTT THE PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT!

We are asking all students not to register for psychology courses at pre-registration and not to attend their present psychology courses in order to protest the firing of Dr. Bertram Garskof. Dr. Garskof was fired because his activities challenged the system of education at this university and endangered the administration's control over this institution. He was helping students to begin to understand that MSU is operated by and for the corporations, the military, and the powerful men who run this society. MSU is not a "university that cares;" it does not care about the students, in the final analysis, and FURTHERMORE it does not care about the people of this country and the people of this world. It cares about some people, but which people?

Because Bert was helping us to understand these things, the administration considered him a direct threat to their ability to control this institution for their own personal gain. He was fired, not only because they disagreed with his teaching methods, but because they were challenged by the CONTENT of his teaching. We agree with the things he has been saying, therefore we support him and we demand that he be rehired, and allowed to go on doing the things he has been doing, the things that have helped so many of us to gain a broader understanding of the university and the society of which it is a part, and of ourselves and the roles we play.

BUT GETTING DR. GARSKOF RE-HIRED IS NOT ENOUGH!

We have added a second point to our program--that the university be opened to ALL people--black, white, brown, poor, working people, all the people who do not benefit from this university--because this is one of the most important understandings that we have gained from Bert's educational experiments and from our association with MSU. We support Bert because we AGREE with him, not because we think he should have freedom of speech as though he were some curious creature that the university should preserve for the enlightenment of its students. BERT GARSKOF IS RIGHT. The university should operate for the benefit of the students and the rest of the people of this society. We can't support him without also supporting what he represents.

We then have to discover how best we can make our support felt, how best we can exercise our power as students in our own interests and the interests of all the people. Admittedly we have very little real power. We are not rich. We are not prepared to take up arms. We hold no important positions in the establishment hierarchy. We do, however, have the strength of our numbers (especially when we ally ourselves with black people, other minority people, and poor and working class whites). Specifically, we have the power to withhold our support from the university in specific cases by not registering for specific courses. We understand that the Psychology department played only a minor role in firing Dr. Garskof, that the decision was collectively arrived at by the Administration and the men they serve. BUT the psychology department is a place to start; we can demonstrate our seriousness and our power by getting together to apply pressure upon this specific part of the institution. We can get together to say to the psychology department and to the University: OPEN UP UP OR SHUT IT DOWN!

It is important to understand that applying pressure to the psychology department and thus forcing the re-hiring of Bert Garskof is not the end of this thing. Dr. Hannah is right when he says that we are challenging this entire institution and the society of which it is a part. We DO want to change society, we do want to re-structure it in the interests of ALL the people. But we can't attack the whole thing at once. We have to start somewhere and we have to do something constructive. The action we propose is just such a constructive starting point. Boycott the Psychology department. Support Bert Garskof and help open this university up to all the people. OPEN UP UP OR SHUT IT DOWN!

CALENDAR OF EVENTS

MON-FRI: 9-5 boycott of psychology department, IM building preregistration

TUESDAY: Complex meetings at 7:30

WEDNESDAY: 3:00 Rally for psychology faculty meeting, Olds Hall (faculty is reconsidering)

7:30 Women's Liberation Meeting

7:30 OPEN FORUM--100 Engineering Building, with Garskof

Rabin--AAUP

Administrator (possibly)

Informal discussion

Friday: Anniversary of death of Black Liberation Fighter Malcolm X.

WHY WAS BERT GARSKOF FIRED?

The issues surrounding the firing of Bert Garskof transcend the man himself or the procedures by which he was fired. They are intimately bound up with what he did; with the vision of education he had; and with the nature of a society which could not tolerate the concrete expression of this vision.

The basis of our present society is unquestioned authority, as children are taught to obey our parents not because we believe what they say to be right but out of fear of punishment. In grade school we learn to look to the teacher as the source of unquestionable authority, both in the realm of making decisions about our lives and our behavior. This authority is based on no claim by the teacher to extraordinary wisdom or virtue but simply due to the teachers superior position in the power hierarchy. In later life having been thoroughly trained in the home and school to submit to authority, we obey without question the dictates of the government, the policeman, the boss at work, etc, without ever asking whether what we do is right, either for ourselves or for other people.

Bert Garskof has attempted to challenge one of the primary bases of authoritarian society—the authoritarian relationship among the teacher, the student, and the educational system. Bert has sought the freedom to teach in the way he believes to be best, while at the same time giving his students the freedom to be truly independent in their decisions about what and how they can best learn. The present system of education seeks to impose an arbitrary structure on the gaining of knowledge—enforcing this structure by the carrot-stick function of the grading system. Organic education believes that people are very different in the ways they can best acquire knowledge. It recognizes the findings of educational psychology that education occurs best when people are learning what they really want to learn—what they consider important. It holds therefore that each person should be free to structure his education in the way that best suits his needs, rather than merely passively accepting whatever structure is externally imposed. Bert Garskof was fired by those in power because he dared to challenge the basis of that power—the unquestioned acceptance by people that those in positions of authority have the right to structure other people's lives.

Whether or not Bert is rehired there is a need for others to take up the work he started and continue his vision. We must look forward from the present crisis to the creation of a free university—one in which structures exist to facilitate the fulfillment of people's lives rather than to impose a way of life upon them. Hopefully Bert's firing is not the end but rather the beginning of a continuing movement toward a free university in a free society.

POSITION PAPER NUMBER ONE—U.S.U STUDENTS FOR A RESTRUCTURED UNIVERSITY (PROVISIONAL ORGANIZING COMMITTEE) FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT STEVE CROCKER 372-0460

R



Another professor, Dr. Bert Garskof, has been fired. Why? What was he doing that caused the Administration to revoke the offer of a two-year contract?

A

Bert teaches two classes, psych. 151 and psych. 490. His 151 class decides democratically what it will learn, and how it will learn it. The 490 class is broken down into several sections, and each one studies what it wants to -- radical education, problems of alienation, etc. Each section is responsible only to itself. The class also receives blanket A's. In all classes Bert encourages students to act on the theories they develop. Why do these things not fit into the University as it now exists?

L

The University is not an ivory tower where students come to expand their abilities and to grow. It is a factory, and a very good one, dedicated to turning out quiet, unimaginative workers for business and government. It is a place that pits each student against the other in a race for meaningless grades. It is a place that is engaged in doing research that does not alleviate the problems of the country and the world, but finds ways to make people accept the status quo unquestioningly. It is a place that takes active part through police administration school and the international center in helping U.S. business to exploit people here and abroad.

L

Bert refused to do these things. He encouraged imagination and the right of people to decide their own lives. He encouraged people to act to change what they saw as wrong. He served our interests as people rather than the self-interest of those who control the University and the country.

Y

Bert's firing is not an isolated instance or an accident. Michigan State University is and has been preventing people from taking control over their own lives. By firing Bert they attempted to deprive us of the right to decide what we wanted to learn and to act on that decision, just as the MSU Vietnam Project deprived the people of Vietnam of the right to develop their own country by sending in advisors to train a secret police force for South Vietnam. In the same way, the Thailand Project reinforces unquestioning acceptance of a military dictatorship by developing indoctrinational education in that country. This same University prevents working people from earning a decent wage or forming a union.

MONDAY
2 PM
NEW
AD
BUILDING

Because Bert is right in what he is doing, and the Administration is wrong in firing him, WE DEMAND THAT GARSKOF BE IMMEDIATELY RE-HIRED, WITH TENURE AND FULL PRIVILEGES OF A PROFESSOR, INCLUDING PSYCH. 490 AND 151 AS BEFORE, AND WITHOUT NEGOTIATIONS OR ADVISORY COMMITTEES.

RESIST
illegitimate
authority

We urge you to turn your classes into discussions of Dr. Garskof's firing and the role of the University in this society. Dorm groups will form for discussions and action. Join us Sunday night at 7:30 in the Union for a final discussion of plans. On Monday, February 3, at 2:00 there will be a rally on Paul Schiff Plaza in front of the new Administration Building. If Dr. Garskof has not been notified of his re-instatement by that time, we will proceed to take the action necessary to gain our demand.

LET THE PEOPLE DECIDE!

People for Garskof.

Winter 1969

'The Outsiders'

In Thursday's State News, Milton Dickerson, Dean of Students, finally spoke to the demands that speak to the real nature of the university and challenge it to serve the people. Milton's incisive response was that the real issue was "outside agitators." His estimate of the situation was also parroted by his faithful underlings, Thurman, Fedore, Nonamakar, and Adams, and others like Milton who are on the administration payroll.

If our memory serves us correctly, we have heard this bit before. During the civil rights movement it went something like this: "Our niggers are happy niggers. It's them outside Northern agitators coming down here to stir up trouble and disrupt our happy Southern way of life."



This same routine was re-written by the US Government to explain away the fact that the Vietnamese people were fighting back against US domination. In this case, we again have the happy southerners, living under the bloody tyranny of Diem, who MSU helped to set up in power. Again we have the evil "outside" influence coming down from the North. Inside Vietnamese, outside Vietnamese, and of course the US and MSU who regard the whole WORLD as their backyard.

Going back a little further in our history, we have the Alien-Sedition laws and the Palmer Red Raids. Thousands of outsiders (foreign-born Americans) were rounded up, held for months incommunicado, and many were deported. In this instance the "outside agitator" routine was a direct attack on the attempts of working people in this country, most of them immigrants, to organize. Attempts to Unionize in order to fight against long hours, low pay and miserable working conditions.

Then, of course, we must pay tribute also to the master of this technique, the one and only J. Edgar Hoover--who can uncover more "outside agitators" per square mile quicker than Milton Dickerson can say "SDS."

It's an old story. Whenever the people fight for justice against those who have a stake in keeping them down, whenever the people demand what is rightfully theirs from the few, the privileged and wealthy, whenever they unite and show signs of strength, those who have a vested interest in maintaining the status quo (for themselves) will attempt to confuse the issue. The "outside agitator" routine is one of the oldest games in existence. As always, its purpose is to avoid the real issue while at the same time dividing students from students, students from non-students, and students from the community.

We should not be surprised when Dickerson and Co. try to run the old "outside agitator" game on us. They are only serving their masters and earning their pay. In this way they not only expose themselves, but they also expose the university and who it serves.

Our only response then to the Dickerson gang, should be:

1 REHIRE GASKOF IMMEDIATELY,

2 OPEN ADMISSIONS FOR ALL BLACK, THIRD WORLD, AND WORKING CLASS WHITE PEOPLE.

IN OTHER WORDS, DICKERSON, TELL THE PEOPLE YOU WORK FOR TO PUT UP OR SHUT UP.

REC-11

Few people associated with Michigan State University remain unaware of the now celebrated case of Bertram Garskof, assistant professor of psychology, whose dismissal by a unilateral action of Dean Winder has set in motion a complex of actions and reactions. We, the undersigned faculty, staff, and other members of the university community, believe that the Garskof case presents a serious challenge to the fundamental concept of the University as a free institution of inquiry and higher learning.

On Wednesday evening, February 12, the American Association of University Professors held an open meeting to establish the facts of this case. Since there were only about a hundred members of the MSU community present, we would like to share our views and concern with the community at large.

We believe the following points were established as facts at the AAUP meeting.

These facts, provided by either the Chairman Lawrence I. O'Kelly of the Psychology Department, or Professor Garskof, were contested by neither of the two principals.

(Dean Winder too was invited but refused to appear before the meeting, and was reported as saying that he preferred only a legal confrontation.)

1. The Psychology Department, resisting strong pressures from higher up, recommended and twice reaffirmed a two year contract extension for Professor Garskof. Eventually it was approved by the Dean, the Provost, and the Board of Trustees.
2. Between November 25 and 27, 1968, Chairman O'Kelly and Professor Garskof exchanged three letters resulting in an agreement to this effect: Garskof would accept the two-year offer if he could not find a more satisfactory position, and that he would inform the Chairman of his decision by the end of the Spring meetings of the Midwest Psychological Association.
3. On January 27, Dean Winder called Dr. O'Kelly to let him know that he was withdrawing the offer to Garskof. This decision was taken without

prior consultation with the Chairman or the faculty of the Department of Psychology. Even the Chairman and Professor Garskof had been given no reasons for the Dean's action as of the evening of February 12.

4. The Dean has consistently refused to make known the reasons for his action, even when he appeared before a closed session of the faculty of the Psychology department.
5. Chairman O'Kelly told the AAUP meeting that the action was the sole doing of the Dean, and that he contradicted the written and twice reaffirmed will of the Psychology department by his abrupt withdrawal of the offer.
6. The Psychology department has found no complaint in Garskof's record as a researcher or in his promise for the future. (Since receiving his doctorate in 1963, he has published 4 to 6 papers a year in professional psychological journals.) As a teacher Dr. Garskof consistently received high ratings and was commended by his Chairman as an "innovative and effective teacher."
7. The only area of formal difficulty was his handling of Psychology 490 (large enrollments and blanket "A's"). However, such practice was not a new thing, even in the Psychology department, and the matter was being adjudicated through normal departmental channels at the time Dean Winder unilaterally cancelled the offer.

The Dean's action is surrounded by extraordinary circumstances. Apparently he had his reasons but he has been noticeably reticent to disclose them. Since the AAUP meeting, Garskof has expressed his willingness to make the facts public. In our judgment, the manner in which the Dean has acted and his subsequent reluctance to discuss the matter publicly further strengthen the concern that the abrupt withdrawal of the offer was motivated by non-academic considerations.

We would not like to see this matter resolved by the forces of action and reaction. We consider that the unilateral withdrawal of a written offer

without warning constitutes unfair treatment of a member of our scholarly community. We strongly urge the administration to reconsider its decision.

Signature

Position and Department

Name (please print)

James R. Anderson

Instructor in Humanities
Assistant Director, Honor College

James R. Anderson

Richard R. Lawrence

Asst. Prof., Humanities

Richard R. Lawrence

Joyce Ruddle

Instructor ATL

JOYCE RUDDEL

Phyllis Morris

Instructor, Humanities

Phyllis Morris

DAILY

EPIC KET

NEW Ad. Bldg.

wed. Egn 3pm

discussion of our
demands.

- ① re-hire Bert Garskof, with tenure, AND 4902/51.
- ② open Admission of ALL BLACKS, Third World, and white Working CLASS people At MSU.



If YOU are concerned about Bert Garskoff being fired, or if you are concerned about Women's Hours, Educational Freedom and the role of this University in Society...

THEN...

RALLY

at the



UNION @ 7:00

TUES JAN. 28

1969



NEW UNIVERSITY CONFERENCE
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
April 14, 1969

Garskof case

Dear Friends,

The eight page document written last October, recommending Dr. Bert Garskof for an unusual 2-year contract, included both Garskof's weak points as well as his strong points. This document has not been released. The recommendation was approved by Dean Winder, and months later, revoked by him. After this dismissal, Professor O'Kelly and Dean Winder each sent a letter to Bert explaining their actions. These letters essentially state only the allegedly negative aspects of Bert's teaching while his excellent qualifications remain unacknowledged. The Dean Winder letter and the essentials of O'Kelly's letter are presented in the following pages.

We also present the basic refutation of these ideas. That is:

1. the acknowledged "irregularities" in Garskof's classroom teaching are practiced by many of the faculty, and 2. the excellent quality of Garskof's work has been ignored.

Garskof was fired for reasons which differentiated him from those that were not fired. In what significant way did he differ from the majority of his colleagues? Many of his colleagues abdicate their political responsibility under the cloak of academic objectivity. The resulting political vacuum is filled by the likes of John Hannah, who is political.

Bert Garskof recognized that political "neutrality" is tacit approval of those who do exercise political power and therefore we must behave as political men. He did this. However, his politics are in opposition to the politics inherent in University policies.

These distinguishing characteristics, and Bert's exemplary performance in other respects, leads us to infer that Bert Garskof was fired for political reasons.

FACT SHEET

DATE	<u>EVENT</u>
1968	
Oct. 16	Letter from Department Chairman O'Kelly indicating tenured faculty of Psychology Department recommended 2-year contract "off the tenure track."
???	Meeting between O'Kelly, Winder, others and University Faculty Tenure Committee at which committee indicated "off tenure track" contract was at variance with University's tenure rules.
Nov. 25	Letter from O'Kelly indicating Board of Trustees approved Department recommendation of an offer of "off tenure track" contract.
Nov. 25	Letter from Garskof to O'Kelly indicating considering contract offer and that an answer would come by May.
Nov. 27	Letter from O'Kelly acknowledging negotiation period necessary but asking Garskof to hurry and decide.
1969	
Jan. 22	Letter from O'Kelly asking Garskof about his Psych. 490 section.
Jan. 24	Letter from O'Kelly indicating withdrawal of contract offer under instructions from Dean Winder.
Jan. 24	Meeting of Psychology Department Undergraduate Committee at which decisions made to make changes in Psych. 490 which were acceptable to Committee and Garskof.
Jan. 29	Psychology Department meeting where Garskof signed waiver to make any information public and where Professor Barch pointed out that public disclosure of information might open up Department for libel or slander suit by Garskof. Vote taken to close Department meeting.
Jan. 29	Following Department meeting, Psychology tenured faculty met and supported Dean's action as it was "in the spirit of their original action."
Feb. 14	Letter from O'Kelly on why 2-year contract offered.
Feb. 17	Request by Garskof to initiate investigation by University faculty committee on tenure.
Feb. 17	Letter from Garskof to Winder asking for a comprehensive statement on withdrawal of contract.

- Feb. 19 Department meeting voted 20-12 on a motion asking Dean to Rescind unilateral action and instead to ask Psychology Department to consider his (Dean's) recommendation to withdraw Garskof's offer of contract.
- Feb. 20 Memo circulated by O'Kelly to have full mail vote on motion passed at meeting of Feb. 19; mail vote motion defeated.
- Feb. 28 Letter from Winder on why he "withdrew approval" of offer of 2-year contract.

February 28, 1969

Professor Bertram B. Garskof
Department of Psychology

Dear Professor Garskof:

On February 17, 1969, you wrote requesting that I provide a statement of the reasons for my withdrawal of approval of the offer contained in a letter from Professor Lawrence O'Kelly to you dated November 25, 1968.

Established procedure on proposed reappointment and appointment of faculty begins in the department. The department initiates recommendations and these are transmitted to the college. The dean has the responsibility and the authority to approve or disapprove. Recommendations on reappointments and appointments are subject also to approval or disapproval by the provost and the president before going to the Board of Trustees if approved at each prior step. In other words, the department and only the department initiates recommendations but these recommendations are subject to evaluation by administrative officers and the Board. Thus, there is a system of checks and balances. The offer to you was subject to my approval as part of the regular procedure for faculty personnel actions.

My decision to withdraw approval of the offer was based on reasons given by the department for the recommendation against regular reappointment as specified in Professor O'Kelly's letter to you dated February 14, 1969, and additional information regarding your conduct of Psychology 490 during this current term. In other words, my decision was based on your overall performance as a faculty member at this University.

Regarding the evaluation of your conduct of Psychology 490 this term, I should make it clear that I relied heavily on information provided by the department of psychology and on Professor O'Kelly's opinion of your conduct of 490. He advised me that it is his opinion that your conduct of Psychology 490 is a gross departure from the accepted academic standards of the department. On the basis of information about your conduct of 490, I reach the same conclusion in regard to the academic standards of the college.

Irregularities in your conduct of Psychology 490, Special Problems in Psychology this term are:

- (1) Prior to the beginning of the term there was no consultation by you with the department chairman or the departmental undergraduate instruction committee on the unusual program to be conducted even though the department had communicated disapproval of your past use of Psychology 490.
- (2) Your stated policy regarding the relationship of academic work done to academic credit received by students in this course is that you do not know and you do not care how much work the student does. There are at least 250 students enrolled with you for 6 credits each under this policy.
- (3) There are at least 360 students enrolled with you in Psychology 490 which is an excessive number in a course designed for individual instruction and close contact between the faculty member and the student. The average number of students enrolled with 28 other faculty members is about 6 per

faculty member.

- (4) You have adopted a major change in the grading system without authorization. Students enrolled were permitted to determine the grading system to be used with the understanding that any student who requested a grade of "A" (i.e., 4.0) would receive it. Consequently, a very large number of students could receive as many as 6 credits graded 4.0 having done little or even no academic work for the credits. The Grading Report adopted in 1968, by the Academic Council, the Academic Senate, and the Board of Trustees requires that experimental modifications of the grading system have the prior approval of the University Curriculum Committee and the Office of the Provost.
- (5) Students enrolled were permitted to decide to open the course to all students who might want to enroll. Policy on enrollment is made by faculty and administration, not by students.
- (6) Students were permitted to enroll without regard to academic preparation to do senior level work in a special problems course in psychology. For example, 39 freshmen enrolled, and there are 16 sophomores enrolled who have a grade point average of less than 2.0.

The department has given you a detailed statement of ways in which you have failed to meet a satisfactory standard of professional performance in the past. Despite the departments expressed dissatisfaction with your previous performance, you departed from the policies and standards of the department and the college again this term. Under these circumstances, I could not continue my approval of the offer.

The person who holds a probationary faculty appointment has the responsibility to demonstrate that he is qualified for reappointment or a new appointment. The decision is that you have not met the requirements for further appointment. Again, this conclusion is based on your overall performance as a faculty member at this University, and solely on your performance as a faculty member.

It is my understanding that you may make this letter public and that if you do, then I may also make public reference to its contents and I may also make public reference to the contents of Professor O'Kelly's letter to you dated February 14, 1969. The latter is necessary and appropriate because my decision is based on your overall record including the matters covered in Professor O'Kelly's letter.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed:)
C. L. Winder
Dean

CJW:djh

COPY COPY COPY COPY COPY COPY COPY COPY COPY

I. Introduction

On Oct. 16, 1968, Garskof received notice that the tenured faculty of the Psychology Department (TFPD) was recommending him for a 2-year appointment "off the tenure track." An 8 page statement from the TFPD accompanied that recommendation on its way to the Board of Trustees for eventual approval. On Feb. 14, 1969, 4 months later, after Dean Winder's (DW) unilateral withdrawal of the contract offer, and the attendant controversy and publicity Psychology Department Chairman O'Kelly (OK) provided Garskof with an explanation of the original contract offer. The explanation was contained in a 19 page letter written to Garskof at his request and following a suggestion made to OK by ACLU and AAUP.

This letter will be briefly summarized in this document. It is available for anyone to read who wishes to do so.

II. The OK Letter Summarized

The letter has 4 sections.

1. A statement of the procedures followed by the TFPD as they decided upon the 2-year contract.

2. A statement outlining 5 reasons why the TFPD did not offer Garskof a regular reappointment.

OK begins by stating "My impressions of the reasons for the tenured faculty decision are now summarized." The 5 reasons (or impressions) are as follows:

A. "Irregularities" in Garskof's handling of Psychology 490.

B. Garskof's failure to submit a final report for a grant provided by the Educational Development Program. He also hired non-majors instead of majors as specified in his application.

C. When teaching Psychology 405 (Modern Viewpoints in Psychology) in the spring term of 1967, Garskof's course content "represented a marked departure from what is described in the catalog..."

D. When writing a letter to the editor of the State News concerning ROTC at MSU, Garskof according to OK's letter violated an AAUP principle in that he signed the letter with his name and institutional affiliation, thus not making clear that in his opposition to ROTC he was not a spokesman for MSU or the Psychology Department. OK's letter goes on to state that in addition, the TFPD objected to Garskof's use of invective in the letter.

E. Garskof did not participate in departmental service and administration satisfactorily.

3. A statement follows explaining reasons for the decision to offer the 2-year contract in the light of the 5 reasons why a regular contract would not be tendered. OK states that the resolution to offer the 2-year contract once it was decided not to offer a 3-year contract was based on certain positive aspects of Garskof's

performance. The passage of the 2-year contract was intended to perform 2 functions according to OK:

A. "to indicate the concern of the faculty over the irregularities in your performance."

B. "to give you a somewhat shorter probationary period to correct the irregularities, but also to convey some recognition of your desirable attributes as a teacher."

The positive aspects of Garskof's performance were then summarized in 1/3 of a page. They included a statement that Garskof's research was of above average quality. Lest the look of 1/3 of a page would look too favorable, OK went on to say, regarding Garskof's research, that it was done largely before Garskof came to MSU (UNTRUE) OK also stated that the high output, "However could not be considered predictive of fruitful research activity, except in the most general sense (??) because of your announced intentions to abandon work in verbal learning in favor of an interest in Political Psychology."

This section went on to state that Garskof's performance as a teacher was perceived as a major positive feature. OK quoted 2 highly laudatory paragraphs at this point from the original report to DW accompanying the recommendations to reappoint Garskof for 2 years:

"The positive aspects of your performance were recognized as follows:

(1) Your scholarly publications in the field of human verbal learning work done largely before you joined the staff at MSU, were regarded as being of above average quality. It was recognized that this output, however, could not be considered predictive of future research activity, except in the most general sense, because of your announced intention to abandon work in verbal learning in favor of an interest in political psychology.

(2) Your performance as a teacher was perceived as a major positive aspect. Our report to Dean Winder, accompanying the recommendation to reappoint for two years, said:

"His teaching of the introductory course has been innovative and well received by students. He has shown a genuine talent for making psychology exciting and relevant. In doing this he has invested much time and effort.

"He probably is a real asset to the University by virtue of his ability to interest and involve undergraduate students in the study of our science. While it is difficult to demonstrate, it is likely that he has played a significant role in keeping bright but disillusioned undergraduates in school."

4. The letter concludes with a quote from the AAUP handbook on Academic Freedom, pages 136-137, which support institutional prerogative to wide latitude in tenure decisions (which this was not), and constitutional right to not bear the burden of proof in tenure decisions.

A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF GARSKOF'S FIRING

The New University Conference believes that a thoughtful reading of the O'Kelly and Winder letters demonstrates better than any document NUC might provide the fundamentally political nature of Garskof's firing.

Let us examine the academic reasons given in Winder's letter. Dean Winder's letter is the document relevant to the withdrawal of the contract, and we are going to concentrate on it in this brief analysis. The letter purports to list the reasons which impelled the Dean to action. The reasons concern themselves with the disregard of informal department rules or practices vis-a-vis Garskof's handling of Psych. 490. NUC asserts that these abrogations on Garskof's part are either petty and/or practiced by many other non-fired professors.

Winder's Reason Number Six is an example of a petty point. The MSU catalogue lists the only prerequisite to Psych. 490 as the permission of the instructor. Garskof was breaking no rule when he gave permission to freshmen and sophomores. In addition, other faculty members allowed underclassmen into 400 level courses.

Of more importance is the relationship between the department and Garskof's 490 class. Three days prior to the Dean's action, the Departmental Undergraduate Instruction Committee, of which Garskof is a member, met and came to some mutually satisfactory conclusions about the handling of Garskof's 490 section. Professor O'Kelly had been informed of the outcome of this meeting before he transmitted the Dean's withdrawal to Garskof. In addition, on the very same day that the Undergraduate Instruction Committee met, Chairman O'Kelly reopened Garskof's 490 section, which O'Kelly had previously closed because he was convinced by the students that they were serious, and that the course would be worthwhile. Clearly, this action did not communicate departmental disapproval.

The other charges of blanket "A's" can be made against so many professors that it can hardly justify firing any one professor.

The charges the Dean raises in his letter to justify his unilateral action seem upon reflection to call for an incredulous, "Is That All" or "So What", "Lots of Faculty Members Do Those Things." Are these acts of Garskof serious enough to motivate a usually circumspect man into precipitous and, in retrospect, irresponsible behavior? We believe the specific acts correctly described in Winder's letter, obviously, do not justify the firing of a good teacher and productive researcher. In toto, however, they reflect, or are symptoms of a deep and unbridgeable chasm between Winder's and Garskof's philosophies of teaching. Much discussion has gone on since the firing about Garskof's teaching and the philosophy of organic or free learning. Individuals not yet familiar with these ideas might read Garskof's article forthcoming in New Directions in Teaching.

Suffice it to say here that Garskof's classroom procedures stemmed from a consistent and well-thought out view of teaching. Viewing his procedures as isolated, irregular acts, or willful disregard of largely nonexistent rules is a form of character assassination and only tends to obfuscate the important issue. What Winder did was to repudiate the values and assumptions Garskof brought into his work. The primary value underlying his methods is a commitment to democratic decision-making in the classroom. The fundamental assumption about the nature of the learning process is that the best learning situation is one in which the learner is self-motivated, self-paced, and when the course of learning is self-directed. Each Winder accusation, and much that is in O'Kelly's phony letter grows out of other

more typically held values and assumptions about teaching.

Repeatedly, NUC has asserted that the firing was a political act. Is the claim that a clash of educational philosophies was involved a refutation of this notion? We think not. The competing educational philosophies at root diverge over the question of power. The radical's vision of a democratic and socially just society demands for its implementation, a fundamental amelioration of the power relationships which now pervade all of our institutions. On the other hand, Winder's and most Professors' explicit or intuitive corporate liberalism demands, for these men to continue to function in ways consistent with their values and material interest, that they maintain the present authoritarian power structure on campus over which they rule.

Both Garskof's teaching philosophy and overt political activity stemmed from his radicalism. Winder's political activity (or lack of), his decision to fire Garskof, his probable sincere belief in his moral rectitude in the controversy, stemmed from his political world view. If we can come to understand the interaction between politics and the nature of MSU as a teaching and research institution, we will begin to understand the level on which the firing was political. We will also better understand the nature of the struggle which has begun to transform our institution and the rest of society.

April 14, 1969

On Behalf of Dr. Bertram Garskof:

The philosophy of education that Dr. Garskof has labeled "organic" learning" is not unique or recent in the history of higher education but does represent a national trend in experimentation and changes that are currently being introduced into undergraduate curricula throughout the colleges and universities in the U. S. The following are just two examples of what other institutional innovators are doing on other campuses.

1. Mervyn Cadwallader, Director of the Alexander Meiklejohn Experimental College, San Jose State College, San Jose, California, established a two-year program which emphasized an unstructured learning environment committed to making undergraduate education "...very personal and very vital and very relevant to the personal lives of the students." As Cadwallader states in a recent article in New Directions in Teaching, (Spring, 1968), "If you are going to make it with this generation of students -- at least the kind of students I teach at San Jose State -- you must take seriously the very personal, private kinds of objectives of these young people, in addition to the public objectives of public colleges."

I believe that Bertram Garskof was trying to make his courses more relevant to the lives of his students by giving them the opportunity to determine, to some degree, the emphasis to be placed on the topics and content of his courses.

2. Peter Marin and Frank Lindenfeld of the English and Sociology Departments of California State College, Los Angeles, California, have recently reported in New Directions in Teaching, (Spring, 1968), an open field classroom" design that they have introduced into their respective classes. Their basic assumptions are very similar to Dr. Garskof's:

- a. learning is an interdisciplinary process and consequently each course experience should be interdisciplinary in content.
- b. learning becomes most meaningful to the student when he participates in selecting the topics of discussion.

Marin and Lindenfeld summarize their concept of the "open field" class:

It is a structureless class which is nothing more nor less than the persons within it and what they bring, individually, into the classroom. Except for the most general definition there is no preconceived set or task. The teacher neither demands nor disciplines; the students' interests are allowed to focus naturally; what occurs, ideally, is that the students reveal through themselves and their activities, something of the world as it exists around them and in them, and their learning and directions radiate out from this center of interest and need. At the same time the students confront the teacher who aids the learning process by the example of his passionate concern with the subject matter and by acting as a resource upon whom the class can draw.

The success of this approach to education is evaluated by the two teachers in the following manner:

Although systematic evidence is not yet available on this, we believe that most students --not only the bright ones--learn more quickly in less structured situations: For such situations tend to be more real to the extent that they issue forth from the students and are not imposed from the outside. Consequently, the students enter more freely into them, participate more fully, and -- since they are more completely involved--tend to learn

more quickly, in a less abstract and bookish way, the subjects on hand.

These are two examples of several articles that have come to the attention of the editors of New Directions in Teaching. As co-editor, I feel that the faculty, students and administrators here at Michigan State University should be aware of the fact that Dr. Garskof is not alone in his position regarding the nature of the learning process. The changes he has introduced in his courses are similar to those being introduced in many colleges and universities today.

Dr. Garskof represents a minority of professors who are committed to the improvement of undergraduate education through transforming the learning experience into a relevant, personally meaningful period of growth for both the student and the professor. New Directions in Teaching supports the direction that Dr. Garskof is representing, hopes that the administration of MSU will recognize the need for radical innovation in undergraduate education and looks forward to the reappointment of Dr. Garskof to a tenured position (if he would consider it) here at Michigan State University.

Sincerely,
Reginald Carter, Co-editor
New Directions in Teaching

Publications continued

- Garskof, B. E. Unlearning as a function of degree of interpolated learning and method of testing in the A-B, A-C, and A-B, C-D paradigms. J. exp. Psychol., 1968, 76, 579-583.
- Delprato, D. J., and Garskof, B. E. Associative unlearning of A-B following A-C or A-B* interpolation. J. exp. Psychol., 1968, 78, 685-686.
- Delprato, D. J., and Garskof, B. E. Unlearning in the absence of new learning. J. verb. Learn. verb. Behav., in press.
- Delprato, D. J., and Garskof, B. E. Free and modified free recall measures of response availability and unlearning. J. exp. Psychol., in press.
- Garskof, B. E. Organic Learning in the college classroom. New Directions in Teaching, in press.

Papers Presented

- Garskof, B. E. Intra- and inter-hierarchy relatedness in verbal transfer. Presented at American Psychological Association Meetings, 1964.
- Garskof, B. E. Unlearning in recognition matching as a function of degree of second-list learning. Presented at Psychonomic Society Meeting, 1964.
- Garskof, B. E., and Weimark, E. Free recall; A two factor model. Presented at Psychonomic Society Meeting, 1965.
- Delprato, D. J., and Garskof, B. E. Free and modified free recall measures of response availability. Presented at Southeastern Psychological Association Meeting, 1969.
- Garskof, B. E. The relation between institutional racism at universities and student dissent. To be presented at American Psychological Association Meeting, September, 1969.

Book in Progress

- Social issues in modern psychology: A book of readings. Brooks-Cole
September, 1969.

Publications

- Houston, J. P., and Garskof, B. E. Clustering in recall as a function of associative overlap. Psychol. Rep., 1963, 13, 699-701.
- Houston, J. P., and Garskof, B. E. Correlation between word association strength and associative overlap. Psychol. Rep., 1963, 13, 866.
- Garskof, B. E., Houston, J. P., and Ehrlich, W. J. Inter- and intra-hierarchical verbal relatedness. J. verb. Learn. verb. Behav., 1963, 2, 229-233.
- Garskof, B. E., and Houston, J. P. Measurement of verbal relatedness: An idiographic approach. Psychol. Rev., 1963, 70, 277-283.
- Garskof, B. E. Inter- and intra-hierarchy associative relatedness in verbal transfer. J. verb. Learn. verb. Behav., 1964, 3, 460-465.
- Garskof, B. E., and Bryan, T. M. Paired-associate learning as a function of the number of pre-experimental associative links. Psychon. Sci., 1964, 1, 28.
- Garskof, B. E., and Sandak, J. H. Unlearning in recognition memory. Psychon. Sci., 1964, 1, 121.
- Garskof, B. E., and Houston, J. P. Supplementary note: Recall as a function of word association strength and associative overlap. Psychol. Rep., 1964, 14, 185-186.
- Garskof, B. E., and Marshall, G. R. The relationship between two measures of verbal relatedness, a preliminary report. Psychol. Rep., 1965, 16, 19-18.
- Garskof, B. E., and Houston, J. P. Relation between judged meaning similarity, associative probability, and associative overlap. Psychol. Rep., 1965, 16, 220-222.
- Garskof, B. E. Relation between single word association and continued association response hierarchies. Psychol. Rep., 1965, 16, 307-309.
- Houston, J. P., and Garskof, B. E., and Silber, D. E. The informational basis of judged complexity. J. Gen. Psychol., 1965, 72, 277-284.
- Houston, J. P., and Garskof, B. E., and Koyd, B. E., and Erskine, J. M. First list retention as a function of the method of recall. J. exp. Psychol., 1965, 69.
- Garskof, B. E., Sandak, J. H., and Malinowski, E. W. A. Controlling the "Fate" of first list associates. Psychon. Sci., 1965, 2, 117.
- Garskof, B. E. and Bryan, T. M. Unlearning as a function of degree of original learning and retention test. Psychon. Sci., 1966, 6, 391-393.
- Garskof, B. E., and Forrester, W. The relationships between judged similarity, judged association, and normative association. Psychon. Sci., 1966, 6, 41.
- Garskof, B. E., Shapiro, E. S., and Brandstatter, J. Order of emission in continued association as a predictor of individual free recall. Psychon. Sci., 1967, 7, 62.
- Sandak, J. H., and Garskof, B. E. Associative unlearning as a function of degree of interpolated learning in the A-B, A-C paradigm. Psychon. Sci., 1967, 7, 215-216.
- Garskof, B. E., Houston, J. P. and Medelick, S. A. Overlap and direct associative strength norms for 480 word pairs. Psychon. Monogr. Suppl., 1967, 2, No. 2 (Whole No. 18), 33-38.
- Garskof, B. E. Response availability in the A-B, A-C paradigm. Psychon. Sci., 1967, 8, 347.

THESE BOOKS SHOULD BE READ!!

ALL of these books re in the MSU Library. Most of them can be obtained in paperback form at any one of the local book stores or from the SDS office in the Student Services Building.

There is also a great number of excellent papers and booklets available from the Radical Education Project (REP), Box 625, Ann Arbor, Mich. 48107, or contact New University Conference every Friday 12 Noon until 1 p.m., 355 Baker Hall.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY:

The Free World Colossus. David Horowitz
Containment and Revolution. David Horowitz
Containment and Change. Carl Oglesby and Richard Shaull

LATIN AMERICA:

The Great Fear. John Gerassi
The Economic Transformation of Cuba. Edward Boorstein

CHINA:

Red Star over China. Edgar Snow
Fanshen. William Hinton

VIET-NAM:

On Genocide. JeanPaul Sartre (Also found in Ramparts, 1968)

C. COLONIAL WAR

The Wretched of the Earth. Frantz Fanon

AMERICA:

The Autobiography of Malcolm X. Malcolm X and Alex Haley
Soul on Ice. Eldrege Cleaver
The Power Elite. C. Wright Mills
The Vested Interests. Edward Zeigler
Who Rules America. G. William Domhoff
Wealth in America. Kolko
The Revolution of Hope. Erich Fromm
1984. George Orwell

Toward a New Past: Dissenting Essays in American History. Barton J. Bernstein, ed.

"Triple Revolution" Liberation April, 1964

THE UNIVERSITY:

American Power and the New Mandarins. Noam Chomsky
The Closed Corporation. James Ridgeway
The Dissenting Academy. Theodore Roszak

Monopoly Capital. Paul Boran and Paul Sweezy
The State and Revolution. Vladimir Lenin

NEW UNIVERSITY CONFERENCE/MSU

offers you an opportunity to work effectively toward a University
and a Society that cares about people.

JOIN NOW:

Name _____ DEPT. _____

Address _____

Business Phone No. _____ Home Phone No. _____

I am unable to join now BUT I want to support you:

I enclose \$ _____ for your continued efforts

Please keep me on your mailing list

If you need my help for a special project, please feel free
to contact me; my special interests/talents are:

Name _____ Dept. _____

Address _____

Business Phone No. _____ Home Phone No. _____

SEND TO:

NEW UNIVERSITY CONFERENCE / MSU
c/o Joe Friedman
1421 E. Kalama₂oo St., Lansing, Mich. 48912

or BRING TO:

355 Baker Hall--every Friday--12 Noon

JOIN NOW*****JOIN NOW*****JOIN NOW*****