by myself based on Senator McCarthy's book. As you will see if you read the article carefully, we do not endorse McCarthy one hundred per cent. He exaggerated in the case of Owen Lattimore. You will see from the November 17 issue of the *Freeman* that we think McCarthy went a little bit askew in his attack on Schlesinger and others. But the truth of the matter is that McCarthy's books are well documented; he gives his sources. What distresses us at the *Freeman* is that there is hardly a professor in the land who will meet him on his own terms, challenging him line by line, instead of taking refuge in a grand shriek of "McCarthyism."

Inasmuch as we are going to print your editorial in the *Freeman*, we would like to suggest a trade even-up. Will you print this letter in the *Vassar Chronicle?*

JOHN CHAMBERLAIN
Editor, the *Freeman*

Professor Lockwood's Denial

I deny the charges against Vassar College and against me made by Nancy Jane Fellers in the article "God and Woman at Vassar" in your issue of November 3, 1952.

Most of the students who were in the same class with her believed in God. Most of them were Republicans. All were good Americans and believed in human dignity. They continued to believe in God, they continued to be Republicans and to be good Americans and to believe in human dignity at the end of the year. They passed the course, some of them with distinction and they expressed themselves freely.

It is obvious that neither Nancy Fellers's beliefs nor her loyalty to them were the cause of her failure. Any honest and intelligent person can see the causes of her failure easily enough in the article itself. Among them are inaccurate accounts of the facts, garbled quotations, argument by innuendo rather than by logic and evidence, argument by fragments taken out of context, by leaping to such conclusions as that there was a plot against her when she was expected to prove or explain her point. These are difficulties that in long, patient conferences of many hours I tried to help her to deal with. But she couldn't.

This country has come to a strange place in its history when a magazine like the *Freeman* takes a student's own account of her failure in college without making the slightest effort to validate the facts. No one in the college connected with this failure has been approached by the *Freeman*. Such omission is not generally accepted by journalists as good professional practice, nor is it the sort of procedure that has made the press of the United States the best in the world and so regarded.

HELEN DRUSILLA LOCKWOOD
Professor of English, Vassar College

Nancy Jane Fellers Replies

To Professor Lockwood

In view of Miss Lockwood's unwarranted threat to me I am not surprised at her denial. It is curious that she did not deny her threat in the presence of my parents. Her only comment then was that she might have spoken "too harshly." Her face was distorted with emotion when she made the threat: "You do not hesitate to break into print with your dangerous ideas. If something is not done, your getting through Vassar will be imperiled."

The threat was implemented by subsequent events. Miss Lockwood was unable to point out just what was "dangerous" about my ideas in the letter defending William Buckley which prompted her threat. Her letter of defense is so vague that it offers no basis for specific reply.

The other students in Miss Lockwood's Contemporary Press are not here the issue. I have not presumed to speak for them. Although I encountered faulty pedagogy and weak administration, I hold great respect for the real Vassar. I have told the truth. I shall not retreat.

To the *Vassar Chronicle*

"Failure at Vassar" suffers from misinformation and omission. I repeat that my experience at Vassar was "the clash of two forces diametrically opposed to one another." Different ideologies can exist in the same area unless the object of one ideology is to destroy the other.

I challenge the honesty of glorifying one view and scoffing at another in the name of "objectivity."

In one of my papers I classified socialism as the "respectable" brother of communism. Miss Lockwood wrote in the margin: "This is the worst kind of labeling and false association—socialism is not a brother of communism. Its premises are quite different." Perhaps she can produce doctrinaire support for her statement and so can I for mine. I had made my statement from a "point of view." She marked from a "point of view." These points of view were not the same. She had the power. I was liquidated.

I was not just "told" that I might not get through Vassar. I was threatened. "Failure at Vassar" has completely omitted this threat, which is the crux of the case.

I opened my "Basic Beliefs" with: "I believe in God, Human Dignity, and the United States of America. Next June I shall believe in God, Human Dignity, and the United States of America." The Vassar editorial asserts that this statement "declares blandly that the author has closed her mind to any possibility of change." If "change" means the *denial* of God, Human Dignity and the United States of America their charge is correct, I openly admit it.

To me it is appalling to label fundamental belief in God, Human Dignity and country as merely "admirable sentiments" and "very commendable."

The opening sentences of my "Basic Beliefs" do not preclude growth. In the nine pages which followed I defined specifically what I meant.

> God to me is the source of all. . . . Without Him life has no meaning. I am a Quaker and therefore I believe that God reveals himself to man in a personal manner. . . . Human Dignity means to me that man has within him an "Inner Light."
>
> I think of the state as my theoretical servant. Also, I think that I have a direct obligation to the state. . . . I am a nationalist. . . .
>
> It is my fervent desire to activate my beliefs by honest analysis of them.

The study ends with

> The search for truth will be stimulating. I am not afraid of the truth that we may find.

Are these words from a "closed" mind?

I was shocked that Miss Lockwood expressed no concern that the Declaration of Human Rights might supersede our Constitution. Were the Declaration of Human Rights incorporated as a covenant and ratified as a treaty (as is now the State Department plan), under our Constitution it would become the supreme law of the land. "The Declaration, among other things is a complete blueprint for socializing the world, including the United States."[1]

The entire Declaration is in basic conflict with our Bill of Rights. The Declaration presumes that the rights of the people emanate from the Declaration itself. For example: Article 24 provides that everyone has the "right to rest and leisure" and "periodic holidays with pay."

Our Bill of Rights holds that free people possess inherent rights. And it forbids infringement by the government of these inalienable rights—for example, freedom of speech and worship. Internationalism would tend to merge our system with that of other peoples and thus change it. Our friends in Europe, especially the British, have drifted into socialistic governments. Socialism and capitalism can not be merged. "These two systems can not live together in the same society."[2]

Therefore there *is* logic in my statement "an internationalist theory . . . may destroy the tenets of that society" [Capitalism].

When I asked Miss Lockwood for an exam in Contemporary Press I knew that the course did not embody an exam. But neither did Contemporary Press ordinarily embody a threat. Positive I could carry the work, what other recourse did I have? Dean Tait initially granted me permission to take a special exam in geology. It was she, not I, who violated the rule.

Was it in my favor to omit the forty-page paper which was supposed to be included in my semester mark? Was telling my parents that Earlham could "do what it likes" with this paper standard academic procedure?

After Miss Lockwood's threat I was quite aware that I was "doing badly" in Contemporary Press. Nevertheless, I was trusting enough to hope that devotion and effort would bring favorable results. The great difficulty was that I knew *why* I was doing badly, i.e., my "dangerous ideas."

I saw Miss Blanding on only one occasion before our final conference. Miss Tait was doing no more than fulfilling her function as Dean.

It was not until our final conference, long after Miss Lockwood had told me I was failing, that I made the decision to return to Earlham. I had no assurance that I would be accepted or that I would graduate from Earlham in June.

My credit ratio was 2.0, not because of consistently low marks but because as a transfer student the A's and B's of my first two years automatically became C's. Furthermore, my credit ratio could not have been lowered by an F that had been removed from my record.

Colleges will accept students with F on their records. I have investigated this matter.

I had no control over what was sent on my transcript to Earlham. The removal of F from my record was a part of Vassar's formula for my continuance there, not a gesture to effect my transfer.

Before entering Miss Lockwood's class I had taken 29 hours of English courses. My marks were: 11 hours of A, 12 hours of B and 6 hours of C-plus. After Miss Lockwood failed me I took 13 hours of English and made 10 hours of A and 3 hours of B-plus. My B. A. degree from Earlham College, where standards are also high, is not an award for "academic incompetence."

I am convinced that I did not then, and do not now have a "persecution" complex.

It is with a full heart that I have recorded my experience at Vassar. Many may not understand that my belief in Vassar and in academic freedom made silence impossible. I feel confident that the *Vassar Chronicle* will continue in its free tradition by printing this reply to its editorial.

[1]See "State Department Half-Truths and False Assurances Regarding the UN Charter, Genocide Convention and Proposed Covenant of Human Rights," by Frank E. Holman, Past President of the American Bar Association

[2]"The Road Ahead," by John T. Flynn, p. 151

Night Cry

Here in the dark and starless night
Where trees uphold the clouded sky
With stalwart pillars, bare, upright,
Is heard a sudden, chilling cry:

Some woodland creature in distress
Gives voice extreme, alone, apart,
To anguish which assails, no less,
The inarticulate human heart. . . .

SJANNA SOLUM