

Unabridged manuscript with footnotes

Cornell in the Cold War (Part 1)

By Glenn Altschuler & Isaac Kramnick

I. "Red Cornell"

"Cornell goes Bolshevik" proclaimed the *New York World-Telegram* on October 19, 1943. The university's Russian courses, the paper announced, were being taught by communists, making Cornell a breeding ground for "Muscovites." For the next several days the paper repeated its accusation in articles and editorials carried in other Scripps Howard and Hearst papers across the country.

The attack was focused on two Russian émigrés, Joshua Kuntz and Vladimir Kazakevich, who had been hired to teach in the Intensive Russian Language and Culture Program, which the University agreed to design for the United States Army in the summers of 1943 and 1944. The Army had chosen Cornell because since 1939 it had offered an innovative Slavic language and area studies program funded by The Rockefeller Foundation. For twelve weeks, hundreds of US Army trainees, in what was called The Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP), were brought to Ithaca and immersed in conversational Russian language training. The students also took courses in Cornell's "Institute of Contemporary Russian Civilization."¹

Cornell's president, Edmund Ezra Day, had been delighted that the Army asked his university to play an important role in the war effort. "Because of Cornell's well-known reputation as a pioneering institution," he wrote after the Soviet Union had become an ally of the United States, "strong representations were made that it take a

lead in the development of modern Russian studies.”² Answering this call was what Day had in mind when he insisted in his 1937 Presidential Inaugural Address that universities had a “social obligation” to “add to the common weal.”³ Not that the Dartmouth and Harvard educated former economics professor at Harvard and Michigan, who before coming to Cornell had been director for the social sciences with the Rockefeller Foundation, didn’t see problems in such activities. “We know,” he later noted, “that we were taking a calculated risk in agreeing to run the Army program,” given the lack of “authentic and validated information” about Soviet Russia and by “an even worse lack of critically trained teachers.”⁴ And, of course, given the potentially controversial nature of the instruction.

Several weeks before the first *World-Telegram* attack appeared, Day asked Cornelius W. deKiewiet, then a professor of History, and the director of the army program that sponsored the language and culture courses in German, Italian, Czech and Chinese, as well as Russian, to inform all the members of Cornell’s faculty about the initiative. Controversial material would be taught in these courses, he conceded, but this was the intention of the army authorities responsible for the program. If instructors had “burning convictions” about their subjects, they should lay out their views and “provide the opportunity for free discussion.” DeKiewiet was as concerned with courses about our enemies, Germany and Italy, as he was about Russia, a “friendly and associated power.” In a surprisingly capacious vision of academic free inquiry, he wrote:

There is no objection whatever to handling controversial material if the purpose is to improve the understanding or promote the efficiency of army trainees.

Marxism and communism, the genuine achievements of Hitler or Mussolini, attractive characteristics of enemy peoples—these can and should be freely handled. The ASTP wishes its trainees to have a mature and sympathetic comprehension of other areas and peoples.⁵

President Day responded to the *World-Telegram's* charge that the students were being indoctrinated by “communist” faculty. Day’s letter to the members of Cornell’s Board of Trustees on January 7, 1944 reflected his reputation for candor, honesty, and idealism:

For reasons which are relatively easy to understand, the only available instructors who have an intrinsic knowledge of contemporary Russian conditions are individuals who had been repeatedly in Russia during the period since the revolution. Perforce, most, if not all of those individuals have exhibited “Russian sympathies;” otherwise they would not have had opportunities for close observation of developments under the present Soviet regime.

The University, he added, could have picked instructors “above suspicion” who had little first hand experience with Soviet Russia or those who “are bound to be in some quarters suspect.” Since the army had a practical objective in the program, “we have thought it was due the men in training to have access to the latter type of instructor.” He assured the Board, however, that “the university would not, any more than the army, tolerate any program of indoctrination. This was made clear to all members of the participating staff.”

Day then reviewed the careers of Kunitz and Kazakevich, their study in America, their travels in and writings about Soviet Russia. “As far as we can see,” he concluded

in his letter to the trustees, “there is nothing in (the) entire record that suggests ‘un-American activities’.” Having talked with the Russians, Day was prepared to vouch for their loyalty and their “thorough” commitment “to the American way of life.” Moreover, he added, the army was constantly monitoring the program and “has been thoroughly satisfied with the character and quality of the instruction being provided.” Day ended the letter with an optimism about post-war “realities” that may not have been shared by all the trustees. The fears of the *World-Telegram* about cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States, he suggested, were unwarranted.

But how, under all the circumstances, this cooperation can be wisely challenged at this time I, for one, cannot imagine. Let me be perfectly clear; I am not suggesting that the USA yield to communism. I am urging, however, that it is of the utmost importance that we learn how to get along amicably with Russia, and that this necessitates a much larger understanding of contemporary Russian life than we have thus far had. I am not myself fearful of the consequences of such improved understanding. Those who think that there are grave risks about closer contacts with Russia seem to me to evidence a fundamental lack of faith in America. It is a distrust which I do not share. If the USA is all that I am convinced it is, we need not be fearful of the impact of alien ideologies. The men in army training appear to have the same idea.⁶

Having reassured the trustees, Day turned next to calming any fears in the general public about Red Cornell. In March 1944 he stated the University’s position in the prestigious *Saturday Review*. Written in an age before professional speech writers,

“So Cornell’s Going Bolshevist! The Strange Case of the Russian Courses,” is a beautifully crafted, at times deeply moving, essay, interwoven with a history of Cornell and an almost lyrical paean to freedom of inquiry.

It was an “unpleasant experience,” he began, with wry understatement, and a touch of intellectual disdain, to find the “good name” of his institution “aspersed in the columns of a metropolitan daily.” Day felt particularly sad for anxious alumni, fearing that their alma mater “is pulled down from the serene heights on which their adolescent imaginations had placed her.” He then addressed head-on what he referred to, in terms not yet part of common American political parlance, as the *World-Telegram’s* “witch-hunting.” It wasn’t the first time his institution had been so publicly attacked, he pointed out, recalling the accusation in the nineteenth century of “Godless Cornell.” Having its “faith tested,” could be salutary, he proclaimed, if it forced Cornellians to realize that “a principal obligation of any university is a certain fearlessness about the knowledge which it professes and the end which it pursues.”

Day then described what he saw as the “two functions of all education” in terms that majestically captured the university’s purpose, framing his exposition in, of all things, Christ’s enjoining Peter “to bind and to loose.” Universities, he contended, “bind men together” in a common historical and cultural bond, preserving and passing on the wisdom and tradition of the past. But the authority of the past could become ossified and stifling, so education had the opposite function as well: it must loosen the tyranny of the past, “emancipate the mind of its people, young and old, from decayed concepts, misleading principles, and narrow loyalties,” to allow them to “live and work realistically

in their changing world.” University education has thus two contradictory obligations: “to perpetuate and to create.”

Only at this point, more than three quarters through his short essay, did Day turn to the facts at issue. He offered Russian Studies as an example of educational experimentation, embraced by the U.S. Army, that would help create “a new understanding of the post-war world.” Although “for its pains” the University had been accused of “indoctrinating its students,” Cornell would continue to teach them about Russia, and about communism. Given the general neglect of “what we now recognize to be one of the greatest moments of modern history—the political and industrial organization of Soviet Russia,” Day conceded that the teachers with the best knowledge of Russia may well have been at some point in their careers “attracted to the communist experiment.” Nonetheless, universities were right to choose them rather than “exiles for whom Russia has become all but a foreign country.” America’s youth, he concluded, should not be denied “knowledge that will enable it to bear....in the enduring tradition of freedom, the weight of the world that is descending upon its shoulders.”⁷

In his 1944 commencement address Day once again defended Cornell’s Program in Russian Civilization by insisting it to be “of the utmost importance that Americans understood its ally Russia more clearly and accurately” and to realize that the world could “accommodate in peace a great Russia and a great USA.” But he was prudent enough, as well, in April 1945 to send for army scrutiny a list of the staff in the Russia program “to satisfy ourselves of the(ir) reliability and integrity.”⁸

Little could president Day know in 1944 that Cornell’s encounter with “a metropolitan daily” was a mere minor prelude to the full blown drama of post war anti-

communist hysteria – the phenomenon we now known as McCarthyism - that would engulf the University for the next 20 years, requiring Day and his successor, Waldo Deane Malott, to walk a fine line, balancing their commitments to academic values with demands of loyalty and Americanism. In meeting these challenges, Cornell's presidents, administrators, and faculty would sometimes falter and stumble as the weight of the political world outside East Hill fell upon their shoulders. For the most part, however, in the face of pressure from trustees, politicians, and the popular press, they bent but did not break. To be sure, as the historian Ellen Schecker has reminded us, Cornell, like other institutions of higher education, did not often provide a sanctuary for dissenters and, at times, lent legitimacy to rabid red-baiters. But the institution did not purge left-wing faculty members. And, it refused to exclude unpopular ideas from Cornell's definition of academic freedom

II. Students and Trustees

Robert Fogel '48, who would win the Nobel Prize for Economics in 1993, was Cornell's leading student radical in the 1940s, when Soviet-American friendship was replaced by the bitter suspicions of the Cold War. The son of Russian immigrants, graduate of New York City's prestigious Stuyvesant High School, where he concentrated on physics and chemistry, Fogel switched to economics and history at Cornell, as well as political agitation - as head of the Marxist discussion group and the Campus Chapter of American Youth for Democracy (AYD), the successor to the Young Communist League, and an organization Attorney General Tom Clark placed on his 1947 subversive list. The *Cornell Alumni News* estimated in Fogel's last years on

campus, that the AYD had “about a dozen members,” with most radical students preferring either the Henry Wallace politics of The Progressive Citizens of America, or the Students for Democratic Action, linked to its anti-Stalinist parent organization, Americans for Democratic Action, founded by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. and Reinhold Niebuhr.⁹

Although his followers were few, Fogel put Marxism on the post-war campus map. In speeches, public debates, and letters to the *Cornell Daily Sun*, Fogel proclaimed that communists “fight for anything that will help the majority of the people.”¹⁰ Fogel’s views would infuriate trustees, but they seldom shocked the student body, a majority of who were World War II veterans. A 1948 *Sun* poll of 500 students indicated that 70% of respondents believed that “we should continue to try to cooperate with Russia.” While 27% felt the work of the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) was “valuable,” 35% thought “it actually does harm;” the rest had no opinion. The *Sun* also noted that non-fraternity students were nearly twice as likely to be liberal as those in fraternities, and that 55% of students with academic averages over 85 were liberal, compared to only 20% with averages under 75.¹¹

Unlike most Cornell students, the mayor of Ithaca was shocked by Fogel’s Marxism. In May of 1946, citing an ordinance prohibiting littering, he banned AYD leafleting downtown.¹² More importantly, Cornell trustees, including Nicholas Noyes of Eli Lilly and Co., Franklin Olin of Illinois’ First National Bank, John Collyer of B. F. Goodrich, and Horace Flanigan of New York’s Manufacturer’s Trust, were convinced that, as Olin put it, Cornell was “riddled with communism.”¹³ Day, who once remarked that Olin “saw a communist under every bed,” had by now certainly shed his wartime

hopes for the Soviet Union, and he reassured angry alums and trustees that Fogel's American Youth for Democracy was "a small, highly vocal and virtually impotent" organization.¹⁴ As if to minimize any need for concern, Cornell's Dean of Students noted that, like Fogel, "most of its members are Jewish" and that they are "attracting almost entirely their own type."¹⁵

The trustees had more than Fogel to fret about. Adolphe Menjou, the film star, who had attended Cornell without completing a degree, told the House Un-American Activities Committee that there was "a group of communists functioning in Ithaca."¹⁶ *Collier's Magazine* photographed a Willard Straight Hall meeting of the Marxist Discussion Group for an article it was preparing on campus reds, and in 1947 Eugene Lyons, author of *The Red Decade*, singled out Cornell in a pamphlet, "The Enemy in our Schools," published by the Catholic Information Society. Other colleges may have been as "deeply infiltrated" by communists, but "few others," he claimed, "have been as frivolous in defending the infiltration or as stubborn in persisting in the error after it has been exposed." Lyons recycled the charges against the wartime Russian program, "honeycombed with notorious pro-Soviet propagandists" and accused the University of using the same faculty, "seasoned mouthpieces of Red propaganda" when it revived the program in 1946.¹⁷

Several trustees were suspicious, as well, that in collaborating with the State of New York to create a School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell was opening the door to subversives. No matter that Governor Dewey, in his address at the School's opening in November 1945, described it as "a school which denies the alien theory that there are classes in our society and that they must wage war against each other."¹⁸

President Day agreed that ILR could well help the nation turn “from continuing warfare between the contending parties in modern industrial enterprise, and toward increasing cooperation.” Nonetheless, by 1947, trustee Frank Gannett cautioned Day that the ILR faculty “can be in sympathy with the working class but that does not mean that they should directly or indirectly promote collective bargaining or unionization.” A year later Day was informed that “some trustees....still regard it [ILR] with horror as an incubator of radicalism.”¹⁹

In the immediate post war years trustees worried a lot about campus politics. In a 1947 speech at Barnes Hall, NAACP leader Roy Wilkins described the new American campaign against communism as “stupid, foolish, and at times hysterical....anyone who challenges the status quo seems to be branded as communistic.”²⁰ Along with the Ithaca Chapter of the American Veterans Committee and the *Cornell Daily Sun*, Fogel urged that ROTC training, a requirement for all male students in Cornell’s land grant colleges, be made voluntary. After voting twice to retain compulsory ROTC, the Student Council endorsed the reform in December 1947. The faculty and the administration, however, would not be moved.²¹

To the trustees, moreover, too many professors seemed to be radicals or fellow-travelers. History Professors Paul Gates and Curtis Nettles opposed Truman’s 1947 proposal for aid to Greece and Turkey in their battle against communism.²² And some scientists, refused to work on government grants, if the research were “classified” and therefore secret. Concerned about the arbitrary dismissal of faculty from American universities, Robert Wilson, director of the Laboratory of Nuclear Studies, Nobel Laureates Hans Bethe and Peter Debye, chemist Simon Bauer, and physicist Philip

Morrison, formed a committee, affiliated with the Federation of American Scientists, “to investigate the spy investigators.”²³

The trustees took note, as well, of the position of the faculty on the sensitive issue of student organization membership lists. For years, concerned that students on academic probation might participate in student organizations, the faculty, with the support of the Student Council and the *Cornell Daily Sun*, had required that all registered student groups submit lists of their members to the administration. In January 1948, Fogel’s Marxist Discussion Group and the Cornell chapter of The Young Progressive Citizens of America refused to comply, fearing that the students named would then be under “suspicion of disloyalty.” Breaking what the *Sun* described as “an all-time attendance record,” the University faculty met in February and by a vote of 155 to 149, repealed the policy about membership lists.²⁴ With considerable justification, President Day feared that the trustees would read the vote “as a victory of the campus reds,”²⁵ and for Fogel. Three months later his assistant, Whitman Daniels, wrote to Day that “these queries in regards to communism and kindred activities at Cornell seem to be coming in with such frequency that I am almost inclined to believe that we should adopt a form letter by way of reply!”²⁶

Of course, Fogel didn’t always win. In early 1949, a year after his graduation, Fogel, still on campus, and, on behalf of his Marxist Discussion Group, invited Eugene Dennis, Secretary of the American Communist Party, then under indictment in Federal District Court for advocating the overthrow of the U.S. Government, to speak at Cornell. The Faculty Committee on the Scheduling of Public Events, however, unanimously turned thumbs down declaring: “No person under indictment should be permitted to

substitute the campus of Cornell University for the legally constituted courtroom as a forum to plead his case.”²⁷ At a rally that April Fogel charged that the faculty caved in because it was “unrepresentative, lacking professors who believed in Marxist doctrine.”²⁸

The trustees saw a different faculty. In a series of long letters in 1949, Nicholas Noyes complained that Cornell was “unwittingly providing a sounding-board for a lot of Reds, Pinks and crack pots.” With “fuzzy ideologies and beliefs,” he suggested, “rattle-brained” faculty seemed to share “the fuzzy moral beliefs of Bertrand Russell.” Noyes endorsed Day’s commitment to fire self-professed communist professors, but he also wanted to regulate “borderline teaching”, which “stops just short of communism”, by faculty who “under an apparent cloak of academic freedom...undermine the American government and the American way of life, and those morals which are generally believed in.” Noyes singled out Cornell’s physicist Philip Morrison “who spoke a week or so ago to a communist front organization,” The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. “This morning,” Noyes told Day, “I am besieged by several of our Eli Lilly executives as to why we have such men at Cornell,” and “it is hardly necessary for me to mention that this sort of thing is going to hurt us tremendously in getting financial support for the university.”

Businessmen might boycott the University, Noyes suggested, if Cornell didn’t stop “encouraging...this fuzzy, un-American thinking and teaching.” Last week, “one of our very great American businessmen” told him that “he was not going to give a dollar to any American educational institution until he could be absolutely certain they were not

encouraging the sort of fuzzy thinking referred to above. He is currently resigning from the boards of trustees of two great universities because of this tendency.”²⁹

Trustees also complained about “pinko” textbooks. When Frank Gannett, J. Howard Pew, John Collyer, and W. C. Teagle objected to the classroom use of L. Tarshis’ “subversive, wicked, and vicious” textbook, *Elements of Economics*, Day and provost Arthur Adams felt the heat – and asked C. C. Murdock, Dean of the Faculty, to investigate. *Elements of Economics*, Murdock reported, “adopts the approach of Keynes...it is admittedly modern and somewhat to the left.”

Deciding to take no action, Adams also sought to placate the trustees, assuring them, a bit disingenuously, that “no member of the Economics Department shares Tarshis’ viewpoint,” but allowing himself to add that “The young men and women who are now studying economics will some day be confronted with versions of this doctrine (Keynesianism)... It would be doing them a disservice to withhold ideas which are a part of current economic thought and to fail to train them in the ability to form and defend their own judgments.”³⁰

The trustees tried a different tack as well, pushing for pro-American courses. Endorsing John Collyer’s proposal for a required course on “the American way of life,” Frank Gannett claimed it “would impress on our students the great benefits that we have derived from our system of government and the opportunities it has made possible.”³¹ President Day agreed, writing to Devereux Josephs, president of The Carnegie Foundation, “That we need such a program of indoctrination seems to me incontrovertible...we are faced with an enemy who is engaged in an all-out mass

indoctrination by authoritarian means.... I doubt very much whether we can relax and assume that in a free society no counter propaganda need be undertaken.”³²

Day also sent the proposal to Dean Murdock, who appointed a faculty committee, which deemed the initiative “a program of indoctrination” – and refused to make the course an undergraduate requirement. Scrambling, perhaps to save face, the University sponsored a series of lectures and conferences entitled, suitably enough, “America’s Freedom and Responsibility in the Contemporary Crisis,” funded with a \$10,000 grant from Carnegie for speakers, and tried, without success, to recruit former president Herbert Hoover as the first speaker.

Clearly, then, president Day worked hard - and repeatedly - to respond to the trustees without compromising academic freedom. An especially thorny challenge came when Nicholas Noyes informed him that Marshall Stearns, who had just been hired by Cornell’s English Department, had been engaged in “subversive activities” at his former institution, Indiana University.³³ After checking with Indiana’s president, Herman Wells, who verified that the allegations were true, Day (for the first and only time, as far as we know) applied a political test for the retention of a faculty member. “Fortunately he is on a limited term appointment for 3 years,” Day wrote to Noyes. “He was already hooked up with us before I had my first report from you...and I do not see that anything more can be done at the present time.” But he wanted Noyes to know that as president he had “put the dean of the college and the chairman of the department on notice with respect to the record the man made at Indiana...if and when the question of Dr. Stearns’ retention or possible promotion comes up for forward action.”³⁴ Stearns soon left Cornell for what became a distinguished career as an expert on American jazz.

As the Cold War shattered Day's hopes for Soviet-American cooperation, and intensified attacks on academic freedom, the president told the Board of Trustees that "a member of the Communist Party cannot be free or honest, and therefore has no place on the university faculty." Communist faculty were "traitors to the American academic tradition." Because "students should see all points of view," communists would be allowed to speak on campus. But only if questions were allowed after the lecture. After the Marxist Discussion Group brought a speaker who spoke about the latest trends in Soviet genetics, he pointed out proudly, "a competent group of animal and plant majors matched minds with him after his lecture and were able to win out very substantially."³⁵

Day went along with a federal mandate that applicants for Atomic Energy Commission fellowships sign a loyalty affidavit. But he opposed congressional investigations of the curriculum. When Congressman John S. Wood of the House Un-American Activities Committee asked for a list of all texts used in the social sciences Day responded that compliance would be difficult and expensive. "More important, what does the committee intend to infer from such a list? Suppose in some courses Karl Marx's *Das Kapital* is on the list of reading, or sections of the Communist Manifesto.... These young people ought to have some acquaintance with these documents. It does not follow because they are cited or used that communism is being taught."³⁶

Day sensed that "a witch hunt is developing in this country" and knew that Cornell's Board of Trustees was not immune from the anti-communist hysteria.³⁷ When Trustee Franklin Olin argued that "our college campuses were riddled with

communism,” or “calls a New Dealer a communist,” or “looked for a red under every bed, even at Cornell,” he “just does not know what he is talking about,” Day told Frank Gannett. Nonetheless, “in view of Mr. Olin’s great wealth” and the prospect that “he might reasonably give us money,” Day held his tongue to Olin himself.³⁸

In contrast, Day tried to persuade Nicholas Noyes about the values of academic freedom. After reassuring Noyes that he, too, “abhor(e)d communism” and thought communist faculty should be fired, Day illustrated the central role of free discussion in “our American way of life” with the story of a student who had recently “confounded a radical speaker and brought an end to a meeting with a simple question to which he wanted a “yes” or “no” answer. If there were a communist government in the United States, would that government permit a meeting such as this?” To Noyes’ claim that Cornell was promoting “fuzzy, un-American thinking, Day replied that “most thinking of youth is fuzzy—is not well defined around the edges.” The amount of un-American thinking among college students, however, “is negligible.” On the “communist issue,” the University had used “traditional Cornell methods, methods of thought and persuasion and ultimately conviction...methods which invariably bring the most effective and lasting results.”³⁹

In 1949, two months before his deteriorating heart condition forced him to resign his presidency; Day was interviewed by a Los Angeles station for Mutual Radio News. He defended ejecting communists from teaching positions, “where their fettered minds have no legitimate place.” But, he warned, this must “not give rise to a sort of hysteria, in which independent and essentially forward-looking thinkers are scrapped along with real members of the fifth column.” Day concluded with a plea that Americans develop

an explicit definition “of the essential ingredients of the American way of life.” Echoing the Cornell historian Carl Becker, Day challenged his radio audience to do what their “founding fathers did not do...to spell out the responsibilities, individual and collective, which go along with the rights they established...responsibilities without which our rights today cannot be permanently retained.”⁴⁰

-
- ¹ *New York World Telegram*, October 19, 20, 21, 23, 1943
 - ² Day Papers: Box 15, August 30, 1948
 - ³ Morris Bishop, p.524
 - ⁴ Day Papers: Box 15, August 30, 1948
 - ⁵ Day Papers, Box 63, September 27, 1943
 - ⁶ Day Papers, Box 63, January 7, 1944
 - ⁷ *Saturday Review*, March 4, 1944
 - ⁸ Day Papers, Box 11, October 17, 1944; Box 63, April 30, 1945
 - ⁹ *Cornell Alumni News*, May 15, 1948
 - ¹⁰ *Cornell Daily Sun*, May 22, 1947
 - ¹¹ *Cornell Daily Sun*, April 17, 1948
 - ¹² *Cornell Bulletin*, May 3, 1946
 - ¹³ Day Papers, Box 49, January 9, 1948
 - ¹⁴ Day Papers, Box 9, May 25, 1948; Box 8, March 11, 1947
 - ¹⁵ Day Papers, Box 8, January 30, 1946
 - ¹⁶ Day Papers, Box 15, August 30, 1948
 - ¹⁷ *Cornell Daily Sun*, November 15, 1947; Day Papers, Box 7, Pamphlet 17, p. 13
 - ¹⁸ *Cornell Bulletin*, November 16, 1945
 - ¹⁹ Day Papers, Box 57, February 10, 1945; Box 32, January 27, 1948; March 17, 1947
 - ²⁰ *Cornell Daily Sun*, May 15, 1949
 - ²¹ *Cornell Daily Sun*, January 22, 1947; March 19, 1947; March 28, 1947; October 29, 1947; December 4, 1947
 - ²² *Cornell Daily Sun*, March 22, 1947
 - ²³ *Cornell Daily Sun*, October 18, 1948
 - ²⁴ *Cornell Daily Sun*, January 14, 1948; January 15, 1948; February 12, 1948
 - ²⁵ Day Papers, Box 5, March 8, 1948
 - ²⁶ Day Papers, Box 15, May 27, 1948
 - ²⁷ *Cornell Daily Sun*, February 24, 1949
 - ²⁸ *Cornell Daily Sun*, April 11, 1949
 - ²⁹ Day Papers, Box 7, May 12, 1949; September 14, 1949; October 24, 1949
 - ³⁰ Day Papers, Box 7, September 15, 1947; October 21, 1947
 - ³¹ Day Papers, Box 5, February 4, 1948
 - ³² Day Papers, Box 5, March 12, 1948
 - ³³ Day Papers, Box 7, August 30, 1946
 - ³⁴ Day Papers, Box 7, December 3, 1946
 - ³⁵ Day Papers, Box 53, August 4, 1949; Box 5, July 9, 1949; January 9, 1948
 - ³⁶ Day Papers, Box 34, July 25, 1949; *Cornell Alumni News*, July 1949
 - ³⁷ Proceedings of the Board of Trustees, April 30, 1947
 - ³⁸ Day Papers, Box 9, May 25, 1948
 - ³⁹ Ibid
 - ⁴⁰ Day Papers, Box 62, April 7, 1949