Michiel Horn

Academic Freedom and the Dismissal of George Hunter[1]

At ten a.m. on 29 June 1949, the Board of Governors of the University of Alberta were gathered in Edmonton for their regular meeting. High on the agenda was the name of George Hunter, head of the Department of Biochemistry. Board members listened to President Robert Newton as he read "extracts from documents which had been before the Board on two occasions, and reported new complaints, some verbal, and specifically one supported by a statement signed by 17 students that on April 7 and at various times throughout the year, Dr. Hunter had in Biochemistry lectures made statements of his personal political opinions."

Doubtless this brought frowns to the brows of some of the Governors. Hunter's views were not a closely held secret, but nor were they of a kind likely to please the business and professional men who dominated the Board. Now he was preaching his left-wing message to his students in class time! He had done this in 1940, Newton said, and had been told to desist.

> In reply to a question, the President stated his recommendation was to terminate Dr. Hunter's appointment with the University, the latest incident being simply one in a series which had caused dissatisfactions accumulating over a period of years. Previous warnings to Dr. Hunter had proved ineffective.[2]

The Board spent the rest of the morning reviewing the case. None had been a Governor at the time of the incident in 1940, and they wanted to inform themselves about the details. They also examined a charge that in 1945 Hunter had filed an inaccurate travel expense claim. Finally they decided to see Hunter, as he had requested, after lunch.

The President had informed the biochemist on 26 May that a complaint had been made against him and that the Chairman of the

Board wanted to have the matter discussed at the June meeting, at which Hunter might wish to appear. Hunter had asked to be informed of the nature of the complaint; he finally received a copy on 25 June, Newton having been out of town for most of the month. This gave Hunter only four days to prepare a statement. In it he denied that he had used lecture time to propagate his political views. He had ended the final class of term at 11:30 a.m., he said in a two-page memorandum: "Then I proceeded to give a short farewell message to my students. . . ." But he recognized that some might regard this as an improper use of lecture time, and undertook to cease doing so. He read his statement to the Governors at two. "After answering questions of a few members of the board, Dr. Hunter withdrew at 2:25 p. m."[3]

He had changed no one's mind. A motion "that the services of Dr. George Hunter as a member of the staff of the University be terminated" passed unanimously. It was then moved and seconded "that the date of termination of Dr. Hunter's appointment be June 30, 1949, and that he be given the sum of $2,000 in lieu of notice and to help him get reestablished."[4] This carried, with three members dissenting. The Board Minutes do not indicate whether the three thought the terms too generous or not generous enough (Hunter's annual salary was $5,100). Either way, one of the university's most distinguished scientists was fired on twenty-four hours' notice.[5]

The dismissal did not go unnoticed, locally, nationally and even internationally. George Hunter had been at the University of Alberta for two decades and was a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada for most of that time. He was listed in the *Canadian Who's Who*, not in itself proof of eminence but certainly evidence that he was not unknown. The Canadian Peace Congress, of which he was a prominent member, protested against the dismissal. A number of individuals did so as well. The Alberta dailies reported the incident and speculated about the reasons for it; Canadian Press filed a story that was picked up by newspapers across the country. *Saturday Night* (then still a weekly) and *Time* followed suit; *The Canadian Forum* carried an article highly critical of the university.[6] Some of Hunter's students made representations on his behalf. The Faculty Relations Committee at the University of Alberta and the Civil Liberties Association in Toronto launched investigations. But nothing availed. Within some weeks of his dismissal Hunter returned to his native Britain, where he found employment in a laboratory. He died in 1978, having never taught in a university again.

Although it created a furore at the time, the Hunter case has not become part of the mythology of academic freedom in Canada. It is scarcely remembered even at the University of Alberta. In his memoirs Robert Newton offers a brief and misleading account of the case that does not mention Hunter by name. The reference to the dismissal in Walter Johns's history of the university is even briefer. Frank Abbott, in his account of the early history of the Canadian Association of University Teachers, discusses the incident in three short paragraphs but, not having seen the sources, makes several errors of fact.[7] No one else seems to have written about the case.

Yet the Hunter firing ranks with the cases of Frank Underhill and Harry Crowe.[8] It raises questions of principle that remain relevant: first, is it appropriate for professors to disclose their political, religious or other opinions to students in the context of teaching? Second, does the dismissal of professors because they are critical of senior administrators constitute an infringement of academic freedom? There are also broader historical questions. Some thought the Hunter case to be a reflection of the anti-Communist campaign evident in many American universities at the time, or the result of pressure by a provincial government known to be conservative. It is worth trying to determine what substance there was to such views. Finally, why did the incident pass into near-total obscurity?

*

At the time of his dismissal George Hunter was 55 years old. Born in 1894 in Ayrshire, Scotland, he had studied at the University of Glasgow, taking degrees in arts and science culminating in the D.Sc. In 1923 he married Dr. Mary Elizabeth Wyllie, a graduate in arts and medicine, with whom he had four daughters. Photographs show him to be an even-featured and even a handsome man. They do not show that he had a physical handicap. From childhood he had a bad hip and walked with a crutch; to this some people would later ascribe his acerbic personality. This acerbity very probably did not develop until his years in Edmonton, for one of his professors at Glasgow described him as "absolutely first class and a most lovable fellow in addition." Two decades later a biochemist at the University of Toronto wrote: ". . . We liked him when he was here. . . ."[9]

Hunter came to Alberta in 1929 highly recommended not only by his teachers but also by his senior colleagues at the University of Toronto, where he taught pathological chemistry after 1922. Among his referees were F. G. Banting and J. J. R. Macleod, co-winners of the Nobel

Prize in medicine for the discovery of insulin. Yet there were hints of possible trouble ahead: ". . . He is not afraid to use his brains and adopt a line of his own" (E. P. Cathcart); "his interests are wide, and are not limited by departmental or even academic bounds" (Andrew Hunter). The man who came to Edmonton to become head of the Department of Biochemistry had an independent mind, and was disinclined to take a narrow view of science and the role of the scientist.

Nothing on file suggests that these qualities troubled anyone during Hunter's first decade at the University of Alberta. He seems to have performed his duties as teacher and researcher to full satisfaction, and if anyone thought him "difficult" there is no evidence of it. He gained election to the Royal Society of Canada in 1933, but did not rest on his laurels, continuing to publish his research findings regularly. On the face of it, he was one of those professors from whom a university is said to draw its glory and its strength.

The first sign of trouble appears in 1940 in a report dated 12 April, provided by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) and purporting to be an account of remarks made by Hunter three days earlier during the concluding lecture in one of his courses.

> This lecture . . . was not on the subject matter but rather was on a philosophical discourse upon the relationship of Science and Religion and Modern Concepts of Living. The general trend of thought throughout the lecture was anti-Christian and pro-Marxism.

The informer cited some details and concluded: "On various occasions during the past years, Dr. HUNTER has spoken along these lines, but today more than previously he distrubed [sic] his students, raiding [sic] the ire of many, but still receiving an interested and attentive hearing from others."[10]

President W. A. R. Kerr did not do what he should have done: call in Hunter to discuss this report. Only after he had informed the executive committee of the Board did he mention it to Hunter. The biochemist asked where it came from; Kerr said this was confidential. Hunter "then attempted to start an argument with me about being a citizen and having the right to talk and that he was not content to be merely a professor of Biochemistry and had views of his own about other concerns." Kerr declined to argue; he simply conveyed the wish of the executive committee for "a written reply in the form of a comment on the statements made in the document," to be available before the full Board meeting in mid-May.[11]

Hunter wrote four pages challenging the accuracy of the points made in the summary he had been given and commenting on them. He did admit that:

> . . . It has been my practice in previous years to give a concluding and for many, a farewell lecture along philosophical lines. . . . Many students have expressed to me their appreciation of the "last lecture."
>
> This year, perhaps unwisely, I continued as usual, to exercise the academic freedom which we have hitherto enjoyed. If in your opinion, Mr. President, such lectures [should] not be given in future, I shall, of course, discontinue them.[12]

There was a war on, and this might force a change in practice.

Kerr sent a copy of Hunter's remarks to the RCMP; in return he got an unsigned, undated report indicating that police interest in Hunter began in 1939. The report notes that Hunter "addressed a meeting wellcome Edmonton members of the MacKenzie Papineau Pattalion [sic]" in February and a meeting of the Young Communist League in March, and that Jean Watts, described as a "Communist Party leader," was a guest at his home in August. The report concluded "that Dr. George Hunter is a member of the secret group of the Communist party."[13]

It is unlikely this report was available to the Board when they met on May 14, for in that case they might have fired Hunter out of hand. (The Communist Party was in particularly bad odor in the months between the Nazi-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact of August 1939 and the German invasion of the Soviet Union in June 1941. During this time the party, under instructions from Moscow, opposed the British and Canadian war efforts.) At their May meeting the Board discussed only the police informer's report of April 12 and Hunter's reply. "It was felt by all present that Dr. Hunter, as a teacher of Biochemistry, should not have discussed his so-called philosophical ideas [with] his students." Several of the governors were ready to dismiss him. Other counsels prevailed and Hunter appeared to defend himself. He objected to what he described as false accusations, regretted "that objection had been taken to his philosophical ideas contained in his final lecture," and promised in future to "refrain from giving this type of lecture."

A few of the Governors still wanted to fire him. Others thought "he should be placed on probation while the R.C.M.P. continue their investigations." The Board finally instructed Kerr to warn Hunter "that any further complaints or criticism would place him in a very difficult position and endanger his retention of his post." Kerr drafted a letter conveying the Board's "objection to your leaving your field of

competence . . . and discussing from your official chair subjects in which you possess no professional authority." His action was "particularly open to censure" because he had dealt "with questions of political theory, sociology and religion, all of them matters of grave difference in the community." Canada being at war, "one incautious word might put the university in an extremely difficult position. . . . A recurrence of the present offence would place your post in serious jeopardy."[14] This letter, while failing to address issues of academic freedom—for example, should *all* professors avoid questions that divide the community?—was clear in its warning. But it was never sent. Chief Justice Horace Harvey advised that the letter might be unnecessary. A recent judgment effectively had made the Communist Party illegal; if it were suppressed "the addressee of this letter might find his liberty interfered with and in that case we would have nothing to do but dispense with his services."[15]

In June of 1940 the Defence of Canada Regulations outlawed the Communist Party of Canada (CPC), and some of its members were interned. Perhaps to the surprise of the Board, Hunter remained at liberty. (This does not surprise his oldest daughter, Dr. Margaret Hunter. Her father was not a member of the Communist Party, she said, describing him as an "armchair socialist" who was radicalized by the Depression and became interested in the theory and philosophy of Marxism-Leninism. He was less interested in its practice, though he supported the "socialist experiment going on in the USSR." Her mother, Dr. Mary Hunter, was more interested in practical socialist politics. She "sympathized with the CCF, and was somehow cajoled into being a Labor Progressive candidate" in the 1945 provincial election. As this was the CPC under the name it used from 1943 until 1960, we may infer that if Mary Hunter was not a card-carrying Communist she was certainly acceptable to the party leadership. Of course, the enthusiastic support of Communists for the war effort since 1941, as well as the role played by the Red Army in helping to defeat Nazi Germany, had made Communists and Communism somewhat more respectable by 1945 than they had been in 1940 or before. This semi-repsectable phase did not last long before the Cold War ended it.)[16] The impression that Hunter *was* a Communist lingered and later served him ill. But we have no reason to believe that, while war lasted, he reneged on his promise to refrain from discussing his views in class. He supported the war and linked his research to the war effort and postwar reconstruction, focussing on nutrition: domestic sources of Vitamin C, and the quality of flour.[17]

*

If, as seems likely, Hunter resented the way he had been treated in 1940, his sense of grievance must have grown after he asked for a raise in 1941. His annual salary, unchanged since 1929, was $4,500, low for a department head. (Most earned $5,000, the main exception being the head of Household Economics, a woman, who got $3,600!) Hunter asked for $5,000, citing his long service to the university and noting that the Dean of Medicine had so recommended in November 1940. The Board executive committee decided that the raise should be considered only as part of "a general change authorized by the Board of Governors." (No change took place until after the war. This did not keep the committee from raising the salaries of other individuals, no less than four in 1941 alone!) Kerr told Hunter:

> . . . the committee does not feel, in spite of its appreciation of your service, able to accede to your suggestion. You will recall presumably that deductions amounting to some three hundred dollars have been restored to your remuneration during the current year. . . .[18]

This reminder added insult to injury. During the 1930s the university had cut faculty and staff salaries. As a response to the Depression this made sense. But the university continued the policy into 1941, when inflation had become a serious problem.[19] The real incomes of professors dropped markedly. "There was never much money at home," Dr. Margaret Hunter recalls.

The Hunter family budget was relevant to the dispute over Hunter's travel expenses in 1945, one that caused his name to reappear on the agenda of the Board. The university's regulations covering travel to scholarly conferences stated that professors could claim only half their costs, net after deducting money received from other sources. Intended to spread scarce funds widely, the policy was a hardship to those who, like Hunter, had families to support.

The details of Hunter's expense claim for a trip to Kingston, Montreal and Toronto in May 1945 are perhaps of interest only to university bursars, but it is clear that he claimed money he was not entitled to under the policy. Still, the $71.17 he claimed would not have attracted notice except for this: C. L. King, executive assistant to the President, knew that the biochemist believed professors should be reimbursed in full. Someone thought an investigation worthwhile. It was learned that Hunter had received a grant from the Alberta Division of the Canadian Red Cross Society not reported on his claim for reimbursement. Worse, he seemed to have claimed $44.70 more than he had spent.

(This was a misapprehension: Hunter had actually understated his expenses.) King then tried obliquely to get Hunter to admit his claim had been incomplete; the biochemist told King, in effect, to mind his own business.[20]

At this point the President entered the picture. Newton did not try to resolve what, objectively considered, was a minor matter. Instead he set into motion a process intended to end Hunter's appointment. He asked the secretary of the Faculty Relations Committee (FRC), a body elected by the teaching staff, to convene an ad hoc group of three, one of them the Dean of Arts and Science, and met them on April 24. After listening to Newton the men agreed that "on basis of this & whole earlier history in this University, Dr. Hunter [is] unfit to have any administrative authority over anyone, staff or student." No one thought it necessary to hear what Hunter might have to say in explanation or defence before accepting Dean Macdonald's suggestion that the biochemist be demoted to associate professor and given a year's notice.[21]

Not until 2 May did Newton inform Hunter that he would be reporting the matter to the Board of Governors two day later. Did Hunter wish to be there?

> Dr. Hunter showed some desire to enter at once on a discussion of the matter, but I informed him that the facts were as stated and that my only purpose in inviting him in this morning was to ask whether he wished to appear before the Board. He expressed a desire to come. . . .[22]

There is no indication that Newton told Hunter his appointment was in peril.

Newton seems to have regarded the biochemist as a troublemaker. Since Newton's elevation to the presidency in 1942, Hunter had not been the most compliant of employees. Not that his offence had been egregious by most standards. In 1943, writing on behalf of his department, he objected to being asked to invigilate examinations in other departments, adding:

> . . . it is a waste of time for most senior staff members to be occupied with such duties. I think it should be the object of the Administration to leave us as free as possible for our proper responsibilities of teaching, research and work, which at least some of us have undertaken, in connection with the war.

His department would invigilate but under protest. Newton replied that he was glad the biochemists were not embarking on action resembling a strike, acknowledged "the excellent work in teaching and

research which has always characterized your department," hoped future differences might be resolved amicably, and promised the registrar would carry out a survey of the practice at other Canadian universities.[23] No report of any survey seems to have survived. In 1945 Hunter raised the matter again, this time at the annual meeting of the Association of the Teaching Staff (ATSUA), "pointing out that this University is unique in requiring this service. . . ." Most agreed that it should be ended, and asked the FRC "to take this matter up with the proper authorities."[24]

In the voluminous file on Hunter this is the only evidence before 1946 that he was critical of the senior administration. But for Newton it was probably enough. He was an autocrat, sure that he knew what was best for the university, and he almost certainly resented the criticism of his presidency. Even an admirer, F. M. Salter, wrote at the time of Newton's retirement: "As a young President he was somewhat dictatorial, impatient of old regulations, rather ruthless, and even contemptuous of the views of others. . . ." And Salter's assessment that Newton had mellowed with experience was not universally shared. In 1949 the zoologist William Rowan wrote to a Calgary journalist:

> He has hurt members of the staff, over-ruled the wishes of heads of departments and introduced needless and unforgivable unpleasantness and grief among those whom he personally doesn't like, and that's quite a number. He has also done many things that are just plain stupid. . . . He has been ruthless in the dictatorial handling of his colleagues. . . .

To R. C. Wallace, Principal of Queen's University and a former president of the University of Alberta, Rowan noted: "It is nothing to do with Hunter that several of our best men have left this place inside the past few years and that others are talking of leaving." Under Newton faculty morale was low.[25]

There is no hint on file that Hunter could not get along with the other members of his department or his students, but Newton found him a thorn in the side. His oldest daughter finds this easy to believe. "He was not an easy father," she recalls, describing him as "idealistic" and "very principled," but also as "impractical," "opinionated," "critical," and "not loath to make his views known," Yet he could be charming, especially to women. She thinks her father "would have charmed Mrs. Newton" but might have been "very rude and unpleasant" to Newton himself.[26] Of course, the critical intellect that is so valuable in the classroom and laboratory may well discomfit administrators.

Newton took Hunter's expense claim as evidence that the man who had filed it was an unsuitable employee. All the same, Newton's report to the Governors on 4 May stopped short of recommending that Hunter be given notice. Perhaps Newton believed that the biochemist should first address the Board.

Hunter nearly did himself in. Far from being contrite, he argued that "he could not afford to pay any part of his trip," that the travel regulations were unjust, that "it was no concern of the University what help he had received from outside sources," that the ad hoc committee had been wrongly constituted, and that he had incurred expenses for entertainment well in excess of those he had claimed. The secretary of the FRC, Ralph Shaner, present as an observer, noted "that greater candor by Dr. Hunter last spring might have saved all this trouble but added that he had heard Dr. Hunter had made a side trip for the Red Cross which accounted for the extra expenses." With the issue of Hunter's dishonesty now in doubt, Newton did not recommend that Hunter be fired. The Governors decided to dispose of the matter at their next full meeting.[27]

At that meeting they unanimously carried a motion condemning Hunter's remarks in May as "offensive and truculent to the University authorities," and his attitude to the regulations as "entirely wrong." They would consider at another meeting "the further question whether the continuance of Dr. Hunter in his position here is in the best interests of the University." Hunter was told to his face that his "attitude when [he] appeared before the Board at the last meeting showed disrespect for constituted authority," and that the Board did not propose to tolerate such behavior.[28] But the second motion passed in May was never discussed. The full Board met infrequently; the agendas were long. The item was twice postponed. Finally Newton said that ". . . he saw no useful purpose in keeping it on the agenda unless the Board proposed to take further action." A brief discussion followed:

> . . . Some members questioned the propriety of keeping avowed Communists on the teaching staff, when members of this party are working for the downfall of our Canadian constitution and way of life. The President felt that the attitude of mind that makes men Communists might also explain their general antagonism to all other forms of Government, including university government as we have it, but he thought it preferable that any action taken by the Board should be based on the satisfactoriness or otherwise of their contribution to the life and work of the University.

The Board then decided, with one dissenting vote and two abstentions, one of them Newton's, to drop Hunter from the agenda.[29]

That hardly ended the matter: Newton was already casting about for a relatively painless method of firing Hunter. Late in 1946 the President had had a meeting with the Dean of Agriculture, who had complained about troubled relations with Hunter and had called the biochemist "a difficult and dangerous man." Asked to elaborate, Dean Sinclair had said that "dangerous" might "not be the right word, but Dr. Hunter had a capacity for stirring up trouble in very wicked ways, putting people at odds with one another." As an example he cited the embarrassment Hunter had caused his colleagues by asking them for help in his wife's election campaign. Newton had asked Sinclair:

> . . . whether he thought it would be a service to the University to get rid of Dr. Hunter. Dean Sinclair replied to the effect that it would be good to be free of him, but that the operation would involve such a row it might do the University more harm than good.[30]

But perhaps Newton saw it as desirable nevertheless. A note in Hunter's file dated 2 April 1947 reads: "Dean Ower [Medicine] said Dr. Rawlinson at meeting of Med. Res. group in Winnipeg in February, 1947, overheard Dr. Hunter, then in company with Dr. Cantor make disloyal statements to Dr. Trueman concerning the President of U. of A." Five days later Newton wrote:

> Dr. Shaner . . . noted that Dr. Hunter had done more talking against the University & its administration since than before being placed on "probation." He had become like the Ancient Mariner who was obliged to tell his story to everyone he met.[31]

Whatever Hunter was when he came to Edmonton in 1929, he had turned into a bitter man who troubled others with his grievances. Furthermore, in Newton's eyes he now added the offence of disloyalty to his other misdemeanors.

After the dismissal Newton told a friend: "I honestly feel that I did my best to get him to fit into the University scheme of things reasonably but had to admit in the end that the task seemed hopeless." We must give him the benefit of the doubt, but there is no evidence in the Hunter file that Newton sought a reconciliation with the biochemist.[32] Instead of setting out to dismiss him Newton might have called him in to discuss the expense claim. He did not. Hunter's alleged communism, his critical attitude to the administration, and his apparent dishonesty loomed larger than his fine work as a scholar and teacher.

*

Sometime after the war ended George Hunter reverted to his prewar practice of using the last class of term to link biochemistry to the larger world. This had landed him in hot water in 1940; it did so again in 1949. On 8 April Walter Johns, assistant to the president, got a telephone call from a reporter with the *Edmonton Journal*. "Dr. Hunter's final lecture in Biochemistry had contained remarks which seemed to support views commonly associated with the Soviet Union and members of the Communist party," the journalist said. Did the President know this, and would he make a statement? Johns called a student in the course, who told him that:

> Dr. Hunter had been discussing nutrition and had gone on to say that the Atlantic Pact [the North Atlantic Treaty was signed in Washington on April 4th, 1949] meant war and that in war a nation's nutrition suffered because the economy was devoted to the production of guns instead of butter. He added that we should never have dropped that atomic bomb on Japanese cities and killed countless innocent women and children. He himself was affiliated with no political party, but this was not a political matter but a question of peace or war and all students should devote their energies towards working for peace and opposing such warlike moves as the Atlantic Pact.

Some students had become restive, and one had walked out, angering Hunter who had "dismissed the class and followed the student, but apparently failed to locate him."

Johns's informant added "that the great majority of students were opposed to Dr. Hunter's views and to the fact that he took advantage of their presence in his class to force them to listen, but a few had applauded at the end." Should the former be asked to give evidence "they would not hesitate to do so."

That afternoon the Director of Cultural Activities in the provincial government telephoned Johns to protest "as a private citizen and as a parent whose son was in the class. . . ." It was acceptable to hold Hunter's views and to express them publicly, but "not in a class room where students were obliged to listen because of the relation normally existing between professor and class." When the reporter telephoned again, he agreed to keep the matter out the newspaper unless and until Newton made a statement, but added that he thought the university should do *something*.[33]

Newton made no statement. Probably he had no wish to draw attention to the incident. But he must have known that Hunter was now fully in his power.

A protest, signed by seventeen of the 257 students in the course, reached Newton on 25 April. "We the undersigned strongly object to the following statements made in a Biochemistry lecture on April 7 by Dr. George Hunter, and to similar statements made at various times throughout the year by Dr. Hunter in lectures," the statement began. It listed six points and provided greater detail than Johns had gathered. "In signing this paper, we assume and have been assured that names will not be made public and will not be revealed to Dr. Hunter," the document concluded. A further document signed by two of the seventeen protested only against the "use of the classroom for dissemination of political propaganda."[34]

The next day Newton informed the Chairman of the Board. Two months later George Hunter was dismissed.

*

The Board's legal right to fire Hunter was unchallenged. He was a tenured member of the faculty holding a continuing appointment without term. But under the University Act he held it during the pleasure of the Board, subject only to recommendation by the president. This arrangement was general in Canada, and over the years courts in several provinces had upheld the right of governing bodies to dismiss faculty members.[35]

Nor were the Governors under any legal obligation to give a reason for the dismissal, to Hunter or anybody else. Whether they also had a moral right to dismiss Hunter the way they did is a question to which there is no simple answer. One thing is clear, however: the procedures used were a travesty of due process. They did not even conform to the policy statement, inadequate as it was, that the Board had first adopted in 1943. Its section on dismissals said:

> The President is . . . bound to listen to reports on the University, its work, or its staff, from any quarter. Neither he nor any other administrative official should make such reports the basis of action against a staff member without requiring that the reports be put in writing and signed by a responsible person, and giving the staff member an opportunity to reply and to appear before a committee of the Board if he desires.
>
> If the President considers that the appointment of an individual should be terminated because of inefficiency or unsuitability, he should as early as possible, and with the concurrence of the Board, recommend confidentially to this individual that he seek another position for the next academic year. In case the staff member has been more than five years in the service of the University, the Board should not, without

> grave reason, insist that the appointment be terminated until the end of the next succeeding academic year.
>
> In special cases the President should continue the practice of consulting with an *ad hoc* committee appointed by the Faculty Relations Committee, before recommending to the Board the discontinuance of an appointment of more than five years standing.[36]

Hunter had no opportunity to respond to all of the material in his personal file on which the decision in 1949 to recommend dismissal was based, and he did not get the required warning. And Newton did not consult the FRC before making his recommendation to the Board. The first of these was the most objectionable. Hunter had every reason to believe that his comments on 7 April were at issue when he appeared before the Board. No one told him there were other charges against him, so that he was unable to prepare an appropriate defence.

The Governors could have challenged the procedural propriety of Newton's actions. They did not. Possibly they thought that firing a "communist" hallowed any means. Certainly they were disinclined to challenge Newton's authority. Like all of the University of Alberta's presidents until 1967, he owed his position not to the Board but to the provincial government. And, as he had reminded the Board in 1948:

> The University Act gives the President the essential right and duty of recommending staff appointments and dismissals. . . . Naturally I shall always be glad to give the Board general and informal reasons for my recommendations, but I do not think I should be required . . . to spend days reviewing files and preparing an elaborate defence of my action. . . . When the Board begins to doubt the care with which I reach my judgments, then my lot will not be a happy one.[37]

No Board member seems to have doubted Newton's judgment with respect to Hunter.

The FRC and the Association of the Teaching Staff were more troubled by the dismissal than the Board. At a meeting on 14 July the FRC decided that it was in the best interests of the University that they inform themselves fully. They appointed a three-man ad hoc committee of inquiry. Newton told them of the incidents in 1940 and 1946. The subcommittee agreed with him that he had effectively observed the procedure as outlined in the Board's policy statement on dismissals because "the recommendation for Dr. Hunter's immediate demotion and subsequent dismissal made by the Faculty *ad hoc* group in 1946 had never been withdrawn," and the chairman of the FRC had been informed, through a copy of Newton's letter to Hunter of 26 May 1949,

that the latter's actions were again under consideration by the Board. Had the FRC wanted to offer advice, it could have done so.[38]

The subcommittee had been charged to speak also to the Dean of Medicine and to Hunter himself but seems not to have done either. Having heard Newton, it was ready to judge that the dismissal "was based on grounds other than those of academic or professional deficiency," that it resulted "from an accumulation of difficulties which [Hunter] had had with the Board of Governors" over nine years, that "in dismissing Dr. Hunter, the Board did not act in a precipitate, arbitrary, or irresponsible manner," and that "the Board's action in this case in no way involves any infringement of academic freedom or civil liberties." Still, members of the subcommittee felt unsure that the dismissal procedure had been followed: Newton should have asked the FRC to convene an ad hoc committee, and should have consulted with the Dean of Medicine before recommending Hunter's dismissal.

In August the Association of the Teaching Staff (ATSUA) carried a motion "regretting the method of procedure followed in the dismissal of Dr. Hunter as reported to it by the FRC," and "requesting that in future an ad hoc committee be consulted, with the consent of the member concerned. . . ." The ATSUA also wanted more information and a statement of reasons.[39]

Newton did not budge. The FRC were advisory to him, he told the committee, and "in the Hunter case I needed no additional advice. I had received complete and satisfactory advice in 1946." As for a statement of reasons: "The Board makes no public statement on dismissals. Such a statement would merely give rise to useless arguments and would be injurious to both parties." He had given reasons to the FRC subcommittee but wanted these kept in confidence. The ATSUA was free to obtain documents, including a copy of the protest against Hunter's last lecture, but in that case ". . . I hope you will make it clear that the Board took no exception to Dr. Hunter's holding such opinions, but only to his voicing them in biochemistry classes after promising not to do so, and that his dismissal was not based on the recent incident but on his whole unsatisfactory history in this University." As for the suggestion that he should have consulted the Dean of Medicine, Newton said he had good reasons for not doing so, "but these reasons I consider to be my own affair."[40]

With variations this statement was Newton's all-purpose explanation and defence. Its vagueness made criticism difficult, and helped to minimize the damage to the university. It was certainly effective in dealing with the teaching staff. At a general meeting in October they

noted that the President and Board refused to make a statement, defeated a motion to read documents supplied by Hunter, and passed a motion "that in view of the absence of further information, this body feels that it can take no further action."[41]

*

Is it improper to introduce one's own political, economic, religious or other opinions into the classroom? What sanctions are appropriate when teachers cross the borders of propriety? Were the Governors justified in 1940 and 1949 when they objected to Hunter's use of lecture time to express his personal views? Should they have adopted a policy statement dealing with this matter? Was academic freedom at issue here?

These questions lead us into uncharted waters. We are discussing an "offence" that many, possibly most, professors commit at one time or another, but one for which few are ever called to account. What professors say in the classroom may be of interest to presidents, boards, and the public, but it seldom interests them enough to cause a controversy leading to an inquiry. A rare example indeed was the investigation carried out at the University of British Columbia in 1918 to determine whether a history instructor had commented in a heterodox way on the causes of the First World War. (When the University of Toronto historian Frank Underhill was under threat of dismissal in 1939-1941, some noted in his defence that he had not used his classroom as a platform for his views).[42]

There is probably broad agreement that professors should not impose their personal, as distinct from professional, opinions on students, nor make themselves classroom advocates for a particular point of view, whether or not they are discussing subjects in which they have expertise. A lectern is not a pulpit. Moreover, students are a captive audience, unable or unwilling to walk out of a lecture or seminar as they might out of a political, religious or social gathering. And it is certainly wrong to expect students, in their oral or written work, to choose between adopting the personal opinions of the instructor or facing academic penalties. Professors may make their own biases clear, but should encourage the discussion of all points of view.

And yet: the line between professional and personal opinion, between pedagogy and propaganda, may be fine and hard to draw. Who can say exactly where the freedom to teach ends? And what do we say of professors who claim that they are not teaching in the formal

sense and are exercising a more general freedom of speech? Hunter told the Board in 1949:

> Throughout this farewell message I was not speaking in a didactic manner; I was not teaching them. I was confronting them with problems faced by all responsible citizens, and kept asking my students "what are you going to do about that and that." As my lectures were concluded I did not feel that I was improperly using lecture time. . . .[43]

We may think him mistaken, that he should have stuck to biochemistry or should have dismissed the class. But this is a point on which people may differ.

The reason why the Board of Governors of the University of Alberta, or the boards of other institutions, did not adopt a general policy statement, if they thought about it at all, was probably that they realized it would be difficult to devise one. It was easier to deal with incidents on an ad hoc basis, treating as an offence a professorial use of the classroom to express opinions *of which the Board disapproved.* That happened in Hunter's case. Had he used his final lecture in 1949 to offer a defence of the North Atlantic Treaty and of the decision to drop the bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, is it likely anyone would have drawn this to the attention of President and Board? Is it likely that the Board would have gone to the trouble of reprimanding Hunter for an "improper" use of classroom time, let alone dismissing him?

Was dismissal an appropriate penalty? It is difficult to quarrel with *Saturday Night*'s assessment: "If there was a single offence, or even a few offences, the use of them to justify dismissal is simply silly."[44] Of course, Newton denied that Hunter's opinions, or his airing of them in the classroom in 1949, provided the basis for the board's action in dismissing him. This was disingenuous. The record indicates that Hunter's alleged communism counted heavily against him, as did the fact that his opinions were capable of being interpreted as pro-communistic. Expressing them in the classroom compounded his "offence."

The FRC subcommittee denied that Hunter's academic freedom had been infringed. They did not divulge how they reached this conclusion, but it may have reflected the view that Hunter had not been dismissed because of anything he had said or done *as a biochemist.* The "accumulation of difficulties" between Hunter and the Board was presumably of a non-academic nature and therefore did not affect academic freedom one way or another.

In 1949 this was a conservative view. In the United States, where dismissals on political grounds had come to agitate the professoriate before the First World War, the concept of academic freedom had since then expanded to include the protection of professors against the exercise of academic sanctions for non-academic activities, such as the expression of nonconformist political or religious opinions.[45] Indeed, threats to academic freedom can be held to include anything that threatens to end professorial employment without a full and fair hearing before an independent tribunal. Professors exercise their freedom to teach and to carry on research through their employment. Ending it without cause or due process is the most serious threat to this freedom that can be imagined, because a professor fired from a position is unlikely ever to find academic employment again. By this argument tenure during good behavior, which is what academic tenure in Canada has become during the last thirty years, is a necessary though not sufficient support of academic freedom. But we need not go this far to decide that the FRC subcommittee erred in its finding that Hunter's academic freedom was not infringed.

The biochemist's political opinions clearly played a role in his dismissal. That made the case one of academic freedom. But this would be the case even if Hunter were fired solely because he was a troublesome employee who made life difficult for senior administrators by being "insubordinate." Academic freedom means that professors are free to challenge scientific or scholarly authority, and that they should not be subject to academic punishment when they challenge civil authority. It also means that they must be free to challenge the authority of administrators and governing boards, to assert their own rights in relation to those legally set over them. Without that freedom the other two are not safe. To put the matter another way: the arbitrary exercise of an employer's power is inimical to academic freedom.

But why should professors be able to claim academic freedom as a defence for criticizing presidents? The answer is that professors should not be dismissed for reasons irrelevant to their research and their teaching. There may be a point at which a professor's behavior so disrupts the work of others (students, colleagues, administrators) that it constitutes cause for dismissal. But this must be established before an impartial arbiter by means of due process. And in the Hunter case there is no evidence that his behavior was of this kind, nor was he ever charged with it by or before the Board.

Hunter's colleagues probably did not believe they had a right, protected by academic freedom, to criticize university administrators.

For example, William Rowan wrote: "If he had been fired on the grounds of being a thorn in the flesh of the management, I don't believe much would have been said for we would all have believed it and considered it, at least from some angle, justified."[46] But while some suspected that Hunter's "troublesomeness" was a cause of his dismissal, no one in authority ever said so in so many words. Newton spoke publicly of "a culminating dissatisfaction over a period of years" and of Hunter's "whole unsatisfactory history in this university" and privately of "a long career of trouble and making trouble."[47] He offered no details. Whether Hunter was sacked primarily because of his opinions about NATO or because of his attitude to the administration, however, academic freedom was at issue.

*

Hunter did not go quietly. There was in 1949 no association of Canadian professors to which he could turn, but he did write to the president of the First International Congress on Biochemistry, A. C. Chibnall, and sent a copy of the letter to the Royal Society of Canada. This got him nowhere. Chibnall did nothing. The president of the Royal Society, J. A. Pearce, went no further than to give members of the governing council a copy of Hunter's letter as well as a copy of one from Newton to Chibnall, noting that Hunter's letter had been tabled at the 21 October meeting of the Council and that "no further action is being taken by the Society in regard to this matter."[48]

A protest by some of Hunter's students who argued that the reasons given for dismissal were contradictory and insufficient to justify it, also got nowhere. No more productive was an intervention by the Association for Civil Liberties in Toronto. On the suggestion of one of its members, the University of Toronto mathematician Leopold Infeld, the secretary of the ACL approached William Rowan. The Hunter case seemed to involve academic freedom: "If the facts establish this, our Association would be disposed to take action in defence of academic freedom and fight his dismissal." Rowan was alive to Hunter's personality flaws, but he did believe academic freedom was at issue.[49] The information he provided led the ACL to launch an inquiry, carried out by the University of Toronto biochemist Hardolph Wasteneys.

Friendly with both Hunter and Newton, Wasteneys might have done a better job as mediator than investigator. He did not know how to proceed, and he had no access to the documents. He had only the brief that Hunter had submitted to the ACL, and sought to balance this by soliciting Newton's account. He then wrote a report that he

offered to Newton for comment but not to Hunter. Aside from Newton only one person saw the report before Wasteneys submitted it to the ACL: Ralph Shaner, secretary of the FRC in 1946 and a member of the ad hoc committee that had recommended Hunter's demotion and dismissal. The Wasteneys report has vanished, but its author's perspective in writing it is evident from a letter to Shaner: "Certainly George, if he saw my report, wouldn't thank me, neither will the fellow-travellers and the trouble-stirrers of whom we have a few in the University group who were agitated by the dismissal."[50] The report recommended "that the matter be dropped." It was.

*

Hunter's dismissal was not part of any "McCarthyite" witch hunt. Public opinion in Canada was strongly anti-Communist, but while Hunter was known to be a "radical" no newspaper went further than saying he was "head of a frankly pro-Communist society." (The reference was to the Edmonton Peace Council.) Whether Hunter was himself a Communist seems to have played little part in the public discussion of the case. The Canadian Press report referred to his "radical political views," but did not specify what they were.[51] In any event, Canadian universities did not witness the anti-Communist campaign that affected U.S. institutions at the time. This was not because Canada was less anti-Communist, but because in this country those known or believed to be Communists had found it very hard to get or keep university employment in the 1930s and 1940s.[52]

Nor was the Hunter dismissal the result of pressure from the provincial government. The *Calgary Herald* and *The Canadian Forum* raised this possibility, the latter more explicitly than the former.[53] But neither offered evidence for the charge of political interference. Nor is there evidence for it in the Hunter file or the Minutes of the Board of Governors. This does not prove there was no pressure. But with Newton and the Board in agreement that Hunter must go, none was needed.

*

A question remains: why has the Hunter case lingered in near-oblivion for the last four decades?

One reason is that in 1949 there was no organization to serve as the collective conscience and memory of the Canadian professoriate. Probably more important is that by 1949 Hunter was *persona non*

grata not only with Newton but with many of his colleagues. "It is most unfortunate that Hunter was the unpopular individual he was . . .," William Rowan wrote; this prevented many of his colleagues from taking seriously the attack on academic freedom inherent in the dismissal.[54] Neither his colleagues nor influential people outside the university rushed to his defence; the contrast with the Underhill case is sharp. The Faculty Relations Committee and the Association of the Teaching Staff abandoned Hunter's cause with little struggle; so did the Civil Liberties Association.

The nature of Hunter's comments in 1949 played a role in the unwillingness not only of people to go to bat for him but to keep the memory of his dismissal alive. The Cold War was well under way by 1949; indeed, the North Atlantic Treaty was a major milestone in its progress. Most Canadians, from the Conservative Right to the democratic Left and including much the larger part of the CCF, supported it. Deploring NATO seemed silly at best, disloyal at worst. Hunter had bet on the wrong horse.

Yet another reason for the obscurity of the Hunter case is that Newton retired in 1950 and moved to British Columbia. Both principals in the case had departed. Since both had been disliked it is understandable that others put them, and the dismissal, out of their minds.

From 1949 to 1951 the ATSUA played a central part in the formation of the Canadian Association of University Teachers. In spite of the Hunter affair, however, the Albertans raised neither academic freedom nor security of tenure as a topic of concern at the early meetings. Instead they, and their associates from other universities, kept their eyes firmly fixed on the need to raise low incomes and improve benefits.[55] These continued to be at the centre of the CAUT's interest for most of the 1950s, although tenure also got some attention. Only in 1957 did the Association begin to discuss the issue of academic freedom, and not until Harry Crowe's dismissal from Winnipeg's United College in 1958 did it suddenly loom large. By then George Hunter was long gone and forgotten.

NOTES

1. This paper is part of a study of university autonomy and academic freedom in Canada supported by the SSHRCC (grant 410-86-0465). I am grateful to the staff of the University

of Alberta Archives, and particularly to Gertrude McLaren, for their assistance. I wish to thank also Dr. Myer Horowitz, in 1987 president of the University of Alberta, for giving me access to the personal file of George Hunter, Dr. Margaret Hunter for talking to me about her father, and my colleagues Terry Heinrichs and William D. Irvine as well as my wife Cornelia Schuh for giving me their comments.

2. University of Alberta Archives (UAA), Board of Governors, Minutes (BGM), 29 June 1949 (microfilm).
3. UAA, RG 19, Personnel files, 73-112, George Hunter Personal (GHP), Robert Newton to George Hunter, 26 May 1949 (copy); Hunter to Newton, 31 May 1949; Newton to Hunter, 25 June 1949 (copy); G. Hunter, Memo to the Board of Governors in reply to statement signed by 17 students concerning my lecture on April 7 and others [sic] lectures, 28 June 1948; BGM, 29 June 1949.
4. BGM, 29 June 1949.
5. GHP, Robert Newton to George Hunter, 29 June 1949 (copy).
6. "Wrong Lecture," *TIME* 18 July 1989; "Academic Freedom Again," *Saturday Night* 19 July 1949: 1, 5; L. Freeman, "Dr. Hunter's Dismissal," *The Canadian Forum* (October 1949): 147, 150-1. See also: "Academic Freedom," *Saturday Night* 18 October 1949.
7. UAA, Robert Newton, "I Passed This Way," unpublished typescript, n.d., 305; Walter H. Johns, *A History of the University of Alberta* (Edmonton, 1981) 240; Frank Abbott, "Founding the Canadian Association of University Teachers, 1945-1951," *Queen's Quarterly* 93 (Autumn 1986): 510-11.
8. On Underhill see: R. Douglas Francis, *Frank H. Underhill: Intellectual Provocateur* (Toronto, 1986) 109-27; On Crowe see: A. G. Bedford, *The University of Winnipeg* (Toronto, 1976) 296-330; Michiel Horn, ed., *Academic Freedom: Harry Crowe Memorial Lectures 1986* (North York, 1987) 75-116.
9. GHP, E. P. Cathcart to C. E. O'Donoghue, 8 April 1929; Hardolph Wasteneys to Ralph Shaner, 20 Feb. 1950 (copy).
10. GHP, Re: Prof. G. HUNTER, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 12 April 1940.
11. UAA, Board of Governors, Executive Committee, Minutes (ECM), 16 April 1940 (microfilm); GHP, Dr. George Hunter, 19 April 1940.
12. GHP, George Hunter to W. A. R. Kerr, 22 April 1940.
13. GHP, W. A. R. Kerr to W. F. W. Hancock, 10 May 1940 (copy); Dr. George Hunter, [n.d.]. Jean Watts was a CP activist with an interest in helping Spanish refugees: Joan Sangster, *Dreams of Equality: Women on the Canadian Left, 1920-1950* (Toronto, 1989) 155-57. The Deputy Attorney General, George Henwood, a few days later told Kerr he doubted there was a secret group of Communists in Edmonton but confirmed that Hunter had attended two meetings with Communists. GHP, W. A. R. Kerr, Memorandum, 20 May 1940; W. A. R. Kerr, Dr. G. Hunter, 22 May 1940.
14. BGM, 14 May 1940; GHP, W. A. R. Kerr to George Hunter, 18 May 1940.
15. GHP, note attached to the draft letter cited above.
16. Interview with Dr. Margaret Hunter, Montreal, 14 Oct. 1988. Margaret Hunter to the author, 19 August 1990. Stanley Ryerson, who was active in the CPC from the 1930s into the 1960s, says he has no indication that Hunter was a Communist. Interview with Prof. Stanley Ryerson, Montreal, 5 Jan. 1990.
17. See, for example: G. Hunter and J. Tuba, "Note on rose hips and evergreen as sources of Vitamin C," *Canadian Medical Association Journal* 48 (1943).
18. GHP, George Hunter to W. A. R. Kerr, 30 May 1941; ECM, 6 Aug. 1941; GHP, Kerr to Hunter, 8 Aug. 1941 (copy).
19. The cost of living rose by 17.8 percent from 1 August 1939 to 1 October 1941. J. L. Granatstein, *Canada's War* (Toronto, 1975) 186.
20. GHP, George Hunter to C. L. King, 15 May and 8 June 1945; D. H. Tomlinson to A. West, 23 March 1946; King to Hunter, 25 March (original), 27 March and 12 April 1946 (copies). The first of King's memoranda carries a handwritten note: "Mr. King: You have already had all the information that concerns you in the above connection G. H." The last carries a handwritten note: "Seen R. N. 20.4.46."
21. GHP, Minutes, Ad Hoc Committee, 24 April 1946. Newton's manner of convening the Ad Hoc Committee varied from normal practice. The FRC as a whole was supposed to select the subcommittee, but Newton decided against this because the FRC chairman belonged to Hunter's department. The chairman later claimed that the president had acted unconstitutionally in not consulting the FRC as a whole, and tendered his resignation. The committee

refused to accept it, all but the chairman having previously approved Newton's action. UAA, AASUA files, Faculty Relations Committee, 73-162-137, Minute Book, 3 May 1946. For the policy see: AASUA files, 73-162, Faculty Relations Committee, Memorandum of the Board of Governors, 11 March 1943, in Respect to Appointments, Promotions and Dismissals, Based on Recommendations by Teaching Staff, 4 April 1942: . . . C. Dismissals of Permanent Staff (3) Consultation.

22. GHP, Dr. George Hunter, 2 May 1946.
23. GHP, Hunter to Newton, 13 Aug. 1943; Newton to Hunter, 16 Aug. 1943 (copy).
24. UAA, AASUA Papers, 73-162, AASUA/2, file 12, Association of the Teaching Staff of the University of Alberta, Minutes of the Annual Meeting, 29 March 1945.
25. F. M. Salter, "Robert Newton, President," *The New Trail* 8 (Fall 1950): 147; UAA, William Rowan Papers (WRP), 69-16, box 13, William Rowan to Richard J. Needham, 21 July 1949 (copy); Rowan to R. C. Wallace, 17 July 1949.
26. Interview with Dr. Margaret Hunter.
27. GHP, Minutes of Proceedings at Board Meeting, 4 May 1946.
28. BGM, 27 Sept. 1946.
29. BGM, 19 Sept. 1947.
30. GHP, Confidential memo, Dr. Hunter, 25 Nov. 1946.
31. GHP, Dr. Hunter, 2 April 1947; Ref. Dr. Hunter, 7 April 1947. The Ancient Mariner was more selective than Shaner thought: "That moment that his face I see, / I know the man that must hear me: / To him my tale I teach." Samuel Taylor Coleridge, "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner," lines 588-90.
32. GHP, Robert Newton to Hardolph Wasteneys, 13 Sept. 1949 (copy).
33. GHP, Walter H. Johns, Memorandum on remarks alleged to have been made by Dr. George Hunter during the final lecture in Biochemistry 11 and 50 on 7 April 1949.
34. GHP, two documents dated 25 April 1949 with a President's Office stamp, one with seventeen signatures, the other with two.
35. Bora Laskin, "Some Cases at Law," *A Place of Liberty*, ed. George Whalley (Toronto and Vancouver, 1964) 177-94.
36. AASUA Papers, Faculty Relations Committee, Memorandum of the Board of Governors, 11 March 1943. . . .
37. UAA, R. G. 19, Personnel files, 81-37-1167, John Reymes-King personal file, Robert Newton, "Professor John Reymes-King," 17 Jan. 1948, 25.
38. AASUA Papers, 73-162-137, Faculty Relations Minute Book, 14 July 1949. GHP, R. Newton, Dr. George Hunter, 21 July 1949.
39. AASUA Papers, FRC, 68-1, box 31, Report of the subcommittee appointed 14 July 1949 . . ., 28 July 1949; John W. Gilles to Robert Newton, 27 July 1949 and 9 Aug. 1949; Minutes of the Meeting of the ATSUA, 1 Aug. 1942 [sic.].
40. AASUA Papers, FRC, 68-1, Box 31, R. Newton to J. W. Gilles, 12 Sept. 1949 (copy).
41. AASUA Papers, 73-162, AASUA/2, file 12, Minutes of the regular meeting of the ATSUA, 28 Oct. 1949.
42. University of British Columbia Archives, President's Office, D IV A 7/2, box 11, folder 8, S. D. Scott to J. D. MacLean, 31 May 1918 (copy). University of Toronto Archives, Office of the President, A72-0033/001(01), Chester Martin to H. J. Cody, 3 Jan. 1941.
43. GHP, G. Hunter, Memo to the Board of Governors . . ., 28 June 1949.
44. "Academic Freedom Again," *Saturday Night*, 19 July 1949.
45. Ralph F. Fuchs, "Academic Freedom—Its Basic Philosophy, Function, and History," *Law and Contemporary Problems* 28 (Summer 1963): 436-38.
46. WRP, 69-16, Box 13, Rowan to Leopold Infeld, 16 Oct. 1949 (copy).
47. *Globe and Mail*, 6 July 1949; AASUA Papers, FRC, 68-1, box 31, R. Newton to J. W. Gilles, 12 Sept. 1949 (copy); GHP, Newton to Hardolph Wasteneys, 13 Sept. 1949 (copy).
48. GHP, Joseph A. Pearce, Memorandum to Members of the Council, Royal Society of Canada, 15 Nov. 1949, and attachments: G. Hunter to A. C. Chibnall, 14 July 1949 (copy), and R. Newton to Chibnall, 8 Aug. 1949 (copy); also: Chibnall to Newton, 26 Aug. 1949.
49. GHP, Letter signed by twelve students to "classmate" soliciting signatures on a petition, 13 July 1949; WRP, box 13, Irving Himel to William Rowan, 7 July 1949, and Rowan to Himel, 10 July 1949. See also: Rowan to J. B. Collip, 30 June 1949 (copy).
50. GHP, Hardolph Wasteneys to George Newton, 6 Sept. 1949; Newton to Wasteneys, 11 Feb. 1950 (copy); Wasteneys to Newton, 20 Feb. 1950; Wasteneys to Ralph Shaner, 20 Feb. 1950 (copy).

51. *Lethbridge Herald*, 11 July 1949; *Toronto Daily Star*, 6 July 1949.
52. See: Ellen Schrecker, *No Ivory Tower: McCarthyism and the Universities* (New York, 1986); Michiel Horn, *The League for Social Reconstruction* (Toronto, 1980) 200-1. Interview with Prof. Stanley Ryerson, 5 January 1990.
53. *Calgary Herald*, 8 July 1949; L. Freeman, "Dr. Hunter's Dismissal," *The Canadian Forum* 29 (Oct. 1949): 151.
54. WRP, box 13, William Rowan to Leopold Infeld, 16 Oct. 1949 (copy).
55. Abbott, "Founding the Canadian Association of University Teachers, 1945-1951."