

...Heimlich, Finley Case

(Continued from page 1)

theless fear that his word may not be believed and that it may be better for him to refuse to answer rather than run the risk of possible later trial for perjury based on false accusations."

2. "A man may sincerely believe that his political ideas lie in the domain of a personal privacy to which he is entitled."

The committee, in investigating the matter, also delved into the professors' past affiliations with organizations cited by the Attorney-General and the Un-American Activities Committee. In both cases the report of the committee showed that neither had a strong tie to these groups.

Neither Tied Strongly to Reds

The report also included the fact that Heimlich had made a statement to Dr. Jones that he is not now a Communist nor has he ever been one.

Mr. Finley, in his testimony before the Senate subcommittee, said he is not now a member of the Communist Party nor has he been one after July, 1941. He declined, however, to say whether or not he was a member prior to that date.

The Board of Trustees did not accept the legalistic view as being pertinent to the case. It also decided that Heimlich's statement should not be considered because it was not made under oath.

The final question, that of how much students' statements should count, was taken under advisement by the Faculty committee. It reported that the majority of the former students' testimony pointed to the competence and objectivity of their teaching. It also emphasized that at no time in the knowledge of these students had either teacher attempted to influence the students' thinking on any controversial subject.

No Attempts To Lead Students

ject.

This, also, was disregarded by the Board of Trustees.

Considering these questions and their answers, we can come to no other conclusion but that the Trustees acted too hastily in deciding that it is either dismissal or testimony. The faculty committee took 16 sessions to arrive at their conclusions. This searching work was tossed overboard in five hours.

We have no other recourse but to believe that the Trustees had decided what was going to be done before they entered the conference room.

We believe they misinterpreted the question at hand. We can understand their desire to protect the University from Communist influence. But we cannot agree that this goal may be reached by dismissing professors for having "impaired confidence in their fitness to teach."

Dismissing Profs Not Way to Goal

It has never been proved that either Heimlich or Finley are members of the Communist Party. But their very refusal to answer a question about this connection has been taken as an admission of membership. "Guilt by association" is the term, we believe. This type of thinking is dangerous to a free society.

The Trustees may be guarding freedom. But they do not take into account that firing men who do not conform to their ideas is not an element of freedom. Sometimes men, in their zealotry to protect their liberty, abridge that very liberty.

We wish to compliment Dr. Jones on his handling of the case and in his taking steps to assure a complete investigation. We are sorry the Trustees did not use some of this considered deliberation in arriving at their findings.