Buffalo Commons Student Perspectives

Buffalo's Labor, Loyalty, & Freedom: Keyishian Revisited

Ryan Harrington

November 9, 2026

About the Series
The Buffalo Commons Student Perspectives Series gives students an opportunity to share original research and analysis on issues of importance to Partnership for the Public Good and its partners. This paper was prepared in Fall 2026 for the **Lawyers as Change Agents course at the University at Buffalo School of Law**. Thank you to Professor Sam Magavern for facilitating this student research.

Disclaimer
The views and opinions expressed in papers published in this series are those of the student authors and do not necessarily reflect the views or positions of Partnership for the Public Good.

Buffalo's Labor, Loyalty, & Freedom: Keyishian Revisited

Ryan Harrington

November 9, 2026

Executive Summary

Americans feared a global communist takeover in the aftermath of World War II. New York State forbade mere association with the Communist Party for all state employees, including public school teachers. These statutes, called the Feinberg Laws, provoked outrage among academics. Five faculty members at the University at Buffalo (UB) resisted, even though it jeopardized their jobs. Those five men, represented by UB Law alumnus Richard Lipsitz, became the plaintiffs in *Keyishian v. Board of Regents*, a Supreme Court case decided in 1967. The case brought union-strong Buffalo to the center of an ongoing debate about labor, loyalty, and freedom that continues to this day.

Ultimately, the Supreme Court struck down the Feinberg Laws because they were overly vague and infringed constitutionally protected free speech. However, this victory did not end the fight for academic freedom. While anti-communist loyalty oaths are a relic of the Red Scare, the same fear lives on in book bans, antagonistic legislation, and word policing because controlling education means controlling culture. Professors, increasingly without union protection, still face many of the same trials today that they faced sixty years ago.

Buffalo's Red Scare

During the early Cold War, conservatives like Senator Joseph McCarthy claimed to be rooting out communists before they could infiltrate American institutions.[1] The House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) launched aggressive 'loyalty reviews' which quickly dissolved into witch hunts that targeted labor union leaders, immigrants, marginalized communities, and university professors.[2] McCarthy's "Red Scare" lasted roughly from 1947 to 1954.[3]

This fanaticism spread to Buffalo, despite its long tradition of liberal, reformed social movements. Before Buffalo boomed as an industrial powerhouse, Western New York was the "burned-over district" of the Second Great Awakening.[4] Religious revivalists, abolitionists, and feminists like Joseph Smith, Frederick Douglass, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton rose from the ashes to lead movements for change.[5] Then, the growth of steel and auto industries brought thousands of immigrants, who, among others, built a union stronghold that attracted HUAC's attention.[6]

Manny Fried was one of the most notable Buffalo figures to appear before the committee at the height of the Red Scare in 1954.[7] Best known for his theatre work, Fried began his career as an actor who appeared in several Broadway plays, but he always had communist sympathies.[8] After he moved to the East Side, he became a high-profile union organizer who rallied his fellow wartime laborers for better working conditions and pay.[9] He was "subversive," according to the

HUAC, a "symbol of the left that needed to be broken."[10] Following his trial, a Jesuit professor from nearby Canisius University announced: "This is the hand that shook the hand of the most dangerous man in Western New York—Manny Fried."[11] Fried adopted that epithet and carried it for the rest of his life.[12] Unfortunately, he also carried the red stain of his alleged communism and struggled to find employment.[13] Undeterred, Fried returned to theatre and dramatized his union activities and harassment in a series of successful off-Broadway plays.[14]

Fried was hardly an isolated target. The HUAC continued to search Buffalo's labor movement to find another prominent local activist: Milton Rogovin. The HUAC questioned Rogovin in 1957, but he refused to answer anything but his name and occupation.[15] Today best known for his photography, Rogovin was working as an optometrist at the time.[16] He drew the committee's attention by running voter registration drives and reading groups focused around communist literature.[17] Like Fried, Rogovin faced scrutiny at home; the *Buffalo Evening News* called him, "Buffalo's Top Red."[18] Despite his initial social and economic ruin, Rogovin devoted himself to photography and published photos of working-class life on Buffalo's West Side. [19] His photography gained him international recognition, and he worked with artists and poets to capture working people in Chile, China, Cuba, France, Scotland, Spain, and Zimbabwe.[20]



Meanwhile, back in Buffalo, the hysteria expanded beyond labor organizations to target a different influential institution: public schools. Teachers at public schools are directly subject to government regulation, unlike their private school counterparts or union organizers. In 1949, the New York State legislature enacted regulations called "Feinberg Laws" to root out teachers with communist sympathies.[21] These laws prohibited "treasonable or seditious" actions and organizations that advocated the overthrow of the American government by force or violence, like the Communist Party.[22] According to historian Marjorie Heims, the government justified intrusions into teachers' personal political beliefs because "they work in a sensitive area where they shape young minds."[23] The Supreme Court during this era occasionally struck down local laws restricting free speech, but New York's aggressive tactics initially won judicial backing.[24]

The Feinberg Laws passed a major judicial test in *Adler v. Board of Education*. Irving Adler, a high school teacher supported by the New York State Teachers Union, sued the state in 1952 after he was dismissed because he refused to answer questions about the Communist Party.[25] He won in the lower court, but the Supreme Court overturned his judgment.[26] Justice Minton argued the regulations were reasonable because: "propaganda can be disseminated among the children by those who teach them and to whom they look for guidance, authority, and leadership."[27] This ruling remained the law of the land until 1967.

Adler ensured that loyalty oaths remained legal across New York public schools, but academic freedom was secure at UB, at least initially. Because UB operated as a private institution until 1953, it successfully resisted state-mandated loyalty purges, and even refused to fire a known ex-Communist, William Parry.[28] Former UB president Samuel Capen emphasized that scholars must be "free to investigate any subject, no matter how much it may be hedged

about by taboos… a faculty of cowed professors can only make a rabbit hutch."[29] Unfortunately, when UB joined the State University of New York (SUNY) system, all employees fell under the Feinberg Laws.[30] The UB oath read: I "certify that I am not now a member of the Communist Party and that if I have ever been a member of the Communist Party I have communicated that fact to the President of the State University of New York."[31]

In response, the Buffalo chapter of the American Association of University Professors held an emergency meeting with over 300 outraged staff members, but ultimately discouraged non-compliance.[32] Nevertheless, four UB employees refused to sign. [33] Those men became the plaintiffs in *Keyishian v. Board of Regents.*[34]

Keyishian v. Board of Regents

Four UB employees refused to sign the oaths and faced potential termination and backlash. These rebels were: Newton Garver, Ralph Maud, George Hochfield, and Harry Keyishian.[35] George Starbuck, a librarian, joined them, though he was not subject to the oaths.[36] Most of them had no communist ties.

Many ordinary New Yorkers opposed the Feinberg Laws for their restriction of free speech and hyper-patriotic rhetoric.[37] George Starbuck and Newton Garver fell into that category. Starbuck was not subject to the specific oaths required of teaching faculty because he was a library acquisitions specialist, not a professor. [38] Regardless, he refused to answer political questions unless the state could justify their relevance.[39] Notably, Starbuck signed a similar oath during his time in the army, but he opposed any future "sweeping, general promise of what I would forbid myself to think, discuss, or condone" on principle.[40] Unfortunately, he was fired before litigation even began and took a new job at the University of Iowa. [41]

Garver objected on religious grounds. [42] He was a philosophy professor and a practicing member of the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers). [43] According to Garver, Quakers believe that Jesus forbade "flattery, judicial oaths, slogans, jargon, abstractions [and] hollow formalities."[44] Therefore, the oath violated his religious freedom and his free speech.

Other New Yorkers rejected the Feinberg Laws for silencing liberal politics. George Hochfield, Ralph Maud, and Harry Keyishian fell into that category. All three were English professors without tenure protection.[45] Hochfield was an American scholar of transcendentalist literature, who left Ohio State University after the president banned left-wing speakers on campus.[46] He felt "rolled over" by the administration and determined to "never let it happen again."[47]

Similarly, Maud thought the oath demoralized professors and turned them against their brethren.[48] He argued: ""The university is making a fool of itself, pretending to enforce a law against subversives by means of a fake certificate which asks everyone to say what they are not."[49] He was an Englishman from Cornwall, but his Russian-Marxist wife threatened to withdraw "marital privileges" if he signed.[50]

Finally, Keyishian, the named plaintiff, wanted to see an end to the Red Scare.[51] He had only been an English professor at UB since 1961.[52] Horrified by the treatment of another group of professors fired from Queens College over similar inquiries, Keyishian refused to sign out of

solidarity and frustration that skilled, dedicated teachers were being chased from the public education system.[53] He wrote: "For me, opposing loyalty oaths was a means of opposing a suppressive atmosphere at odds with the entire academic project."[54] Keyishian believed that academia could not flourish without free expression and free discussion.[55]

The plaintiffs enlisted Richard Lipsitz. Lipsitz was a celebrated union attorney and a UB alum.[56] He began law school at UB in 1940 to follow in his father's footsteps. [57] There, he took specialized courses in labor law and workers' compensation. [58] He graduated after only two years, then joined the army and served in Japan during World War II. [59] Upon returning, he put his training to work representing local labor organizations.[60] Operating during Buffalo's industrial boom, Lipsitz built a loyal blue-collar client base. [61] His son Richard recalls that union leaders really "listened to my father."[62] Like several of the plaintiffs, Lipsitz was not a "communist, or a communist attorney," but simply "defended people who refused to take the oaths whether they were communists or not."[63]

Early in the litigation, Lipsitz moved for a preliminary injunction to prevent retaliation against the professors. [64] The lower court denied the motion.[65] Keyishian later alleged that retaliation was not a concern because UB administration intended to bolster the chances of a successful lawsuit.[66] He noted that his original non-renewal letter explicitly cited his refusal to sign the oath as the only reason for action against him.[67] The school was not required to provide a reason, but because it did, Lipsitz was able to rule out performance issues or lack of need as possible reasons for Keyishian's dismissal.[68]

Nevertheless, UB fired two more English professors during the lawsuit: Gregory Corso and Paul Sporn.[69] Sporn actually signed the oath, but his landlady alleged that he was a party member who held political meetings in his apartment. [70] He was dismissed based only on that circumstantial evidence. [71] By the time the Supreme Court agreed to hear the appeal in 1966, only Garver and Hochfield remained at UB.[72] Some of the other plaintiffs found jobs at private institutions, where the restrictions were less stringent.[73]

Lipsitz initially offered the Court a way to strike down the UB oaths without overturning *Adler,* believing a narrower distinction was easier to win. To that end, he emphasized the different demographics and goals at a college, as opposed to a high school. [74] Still, he viewed *Keyishian* as an opportunity of "at last eliminating the doctrine of guilt by association that represents an aberration on the American scene."[75] As the lawsuit progressed, he focused more on the confusing system of anti-communist laws and their civil rights violations.[76] Oral argument began on November 17, 1966.[77] Nan Haynes, Lipsitz's daughter, who accompanied him, recalls that "he seemed nervous, which was unusual."[78] Lipsitz had never argued before the Supreme Court before and was in for a contentious battle. [79]

New York State attorneys defended the law as a valid exercise of state regulation. The State cited the legitimacy and necessity of its interest in protecting education from subversion.[80] Ruth Kessler Toch, the New York assistant attorney general, argued that the laws were constitutional because the accused still had a right to challenge their dismissal in court, where the state bore the burden of proof.[81]

Ultimately, the court invalidated the Feinberg Laws in a 5-4 decision.[83] According to Justice Brennan Jr., who wrote for the majority, the laws were both unconstitutionally vague and a violation of the First Amendment.[84] He took specific issue with the phrase "treasonable or seditious utterances or acts," which was virtually limitless given that it covered the teaching or public display of books or lectures that advocated revolution even for educational purposes.[85] This could stretch to academic discussion of the Bolshevik rising, or even the French and American Revolutions. Further, he worried the laws could extend to abstract advocacy for these concepts even if the specific professor had no intention to indoctrinate or incite others.[86] Finally, he argued: "mere knowing membership without specific intent to further the unlawful aims of an organization is not a constitutionally adequate basis for exclusion from such positions as held by appellants."[87] Brennan also rejected Toch's defense, ruling that even if the state's goals were legitimate, the statutes infringed too broadly on constitutional liberties when narrower measures would suffice.[88]

> "Our nation is deeply committed to safeguarding academic freedom, which is of **transcendent value** to all of us, and not merely to the teachers concerned…." Brennan.[82]

Brennan's decision provoked heated responses around the country. Justice Thomas Clark, writing for the dissent, argued that the Court improperly overruled *Adler* and destroyed the fundamental American value of self-preservation. He wrote: "Our public educational system is the genius of our democracy. The minds of our youth are developed there, and the character of that development will determine the future of our land."[89] To Clark, the worldwide war against communism was a more than sufficient justification for the restriction of some civil rights.[90]

Many publications shared his views. According to the *Buffalo Evening News*, the Court destroyed "our state policy of keeping communists and other subversives from teaching in public schools."[91] Protestors poured into the Court, and Brennan and Lipsitz received hate letters that decried them for abandoning American values and soldiers still fighting against communism in Vietnam.[92] One letter to Brennan from St. Petersburg, Florida, read: "Of all human scum balls, you top the list!"[93] Hochfield and Garver, still at UB, fared only slightly better.

While many students respected their professors for standing against the Red Scare, not everyone was satisfied with the outcome.[94] In a Buffalo Law Review article, David Pfalzgraf advocated for a middle ground where "the subversive teacher can be prevented from carrying out his callous indoctrination of students" but is not "faced with the uncertainties with which he was confronted under the Feinberg Laws."[95] The Feinberg Laws restricted teachers regardless of whether they engaged in callous indoctrination.

Despite this major Supreme Court victory, the end of the Red Scare, and growing support all around, academic freedom remains a moving target in Buffalo. Following in the plaintiffs' footsteps, individuals can still push back and make a difference.

Academic Freedom in Contemporary Scholarship

Even after the Red Scare and the global war against communism, the debate over how to prevent indoctrination while protecting free speech continues. Keyishian permanently altered the

legal landscape, but, according to contemporary scholars, the fight for academic freedom continues.

The modern New York State legislature enacted laws specifically designed to protect academic freedom. Currently, professors at public institutions are entitled to: 1) freedom in research and publication; 2) freedom in the classroom to discuss controversial issues relevant to the discipline; and 3) extramural and intramural free speech and publication aside from threats or incitement of imminent lawless action.[96] While not as restrictive as the Feinberg Laws, these provisions still provide some degree of regulation of academic conduct.

Academic freedom may provide wide benefits, but there are legitimate concerns about professorial speech. According to James Gardner, a retired UB professor and constitutional law scholar, while academic freedom is paramount to a university's mission, "professors who exercise academic freedom to the maximum are idiots and bad teachers," because students are less open to discussion or engagement when they feel pressured by a professor's personal political beliefs.[97]

Furthermore, loyalty oaths may be appropriate in some professional contexts. In post-*Keyishian* America, professors and students enjoy a presumption against the oaths, but military officers and elected officials retain them.[98] Gardner argued: "[Oaths] lie along a spectrum from totally inappropriate to very appropriate…We want anyone doing the people's work to commit to advancing the common good."[99] The Feinberg Laws, however, represented a much broader and more dangerous overreach by targeting educators rather than state security personnel.[100]

Loyalty oaths could still return to academia. Since 1967, the Supreme Court has repeatedly cited *Keyishian* to strike down similar laws that restricted speech.[101] Unfortunately, by 2000 the tide turned when the U.S. Court of Appeals declined to apply *Keyishian* in *Urofsky v. Gilmore.*[102] Without overturning *Keyishian*, the Appeals Court distinguished a Virginia law that prohibited professors from accessing sexually explicit materials on state-owned computers without prior authorization.[103] While this may sound reasonable, professors could not research sexual themes in art, literature, history, or mental and medical issues. [104] This provision undoubtedly stifles academic discourse. The Supreme Court declined to hear an appeal, leaving the ruling in place.[105]

The *Urofsky* ruling led many to speculate that the modern Court would not strike down loyalty oaths enacted today. Richard Lipsitz' daughter, Nan Haynes, a UB Legal Writing professor, worries that a conservative court might uphold loyalty oaths, even in the face of extreme public backlash.[106] Later in his life, Keyishian expressed the same fear.[107]

Many conservative politicians impede the free flow of ideas. Keyishian saw red flashes of McCarthyism in modern book bans.[109] He argued that "in both instances, the aim is to intimidate those who wish to seek information, to think and draw conclusions freely from their evidence and analysis, without fear of political consequences."[110] Similarly, Haynes notes attacks on professors who have promoted Black Lives Matter or pro-Palestinian discourse. [111] She argues: "I only see academic freedom as being diminished since" the lawsuit.[112]

> "[It is] upon students, scholars, and concerned citizens of our day will fall the task of **reviving democracy** for future generations," Keyishian.[108]

The word "communist" has **lost all meaning** in American debate. At least during the Red Scare, they knew what they were looking for.

There may even be more cause for concern than under Feinberg. During the Cold War, a worldwide Communist takeover was a legitimate threat to American democracy, but after the fall of the Soviet Union, this concern is null. [113] Now, according to Richard Lipsitz' son, also Richard Lipsitz, the president emeritus of the Western New York Area Labor Federation, "[Trump] brands anyone who is opposing totalitarian takeover of the United States government… when he feels like it, he calls them socialists, or idiots, or sick people."[114]

In another vein, Gardner notes that, while one of Trump's goals is to take control of teaching from the lowest level, there is also a "left-wing movement going on for probably twenty years to try to control vocabulary and indirectly control ideas."[115] Lipsitz agrees that the Left's word policing does not combat Trumpism or further academic thought.[116]

Where legislatures are not inclined to help, professors can rely on unions. Unfortunately, unions are rapidly weakening in the United States due to several offensive tactics from state governments and corporations.[117] At nearby Canisius University, the AAUP chapter recently organized a protest in 2024 against monumental budget cuts to the philosophy, history, and English departments as well as failure to compensate for cost-of-living increases. [118] Despite national recognition, the university then released a statement that the union "does not have formal standing or [an] official role in Canisius University's governance structure and does not represent Canisius faculty."[119]

There is no simple solution or American guarantee of freedom in academic circles. "Freedom is not a given, but a goal; it is to be built," argued Tanya Loughead, the former president of the Canisius union, "Freedom is never built apart from others and in opposition to them, but in concert with them and with their assistance."[120]

Academic freedom, like any other freedom, is a battle long fought, but in the "city of good neighbors" there are many communities dedicated to the protection of that freedom. While the current political climate presents challenges to intellectuals, *Keyishian* set the enduring precedent that loyalty oaths are unconstitutional. Buffalo, through the support of labor unions, can help preserve this model in our universities and defend free thought.

Endnotes

[1] Brie D. Sherwin, "Hocus Pocus: Modern-Day Manifestations of Witch Hunts," *Northwestern Journal of Law and Social Policy* 19, no. 1 (Fall 2023): 25, https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/hocus-pocus-modern-day-manifestations-witch-hunts/docview/2895422046/se-2.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] James Gardner (University at Buffalo School of Law Professor & Former Administrative Dean), interview by Ryan Harrington, Zoom, Oct. 7, 2026.

[5] Spencer W. McBride & Jennifer H. Dorsey, *New York's Burned-over District: A Documentary History*, (Ithica: Cornell University Press, 2023), 383.

[6] Joy A. Scimé, *Buffalo Labor History: A Preliminary Bibliography*, (State University of New York at Buffalo: 1978).

[7] Barry B. Witham, "Forgetting and Remembering the Labor Plays of Manny Fried," *Miranda* 13, no.1 (2016): 7, https://doi.org/10.4000/miranda.9729.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Jeff Z. Klein, "Heritage Moments: Manny Fried, Buffalo's 'Most Dangerous Man,' *Buffalo-Toronto Public Media,* Niagara Frontier Heritage Project, Dec. 11, 2025, https://www.btpm.org/2025-12-11/heritage-moments-manny-fried-buffalos-most-dangerous-man.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Emanuel Fried, *Most Dangerous Man: A Personal Memoir*, (Arkansas: John Brown Press, 2010), 3.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Witham, "Forgetting and Remembering," 10.

[15] Janet Zandy, "Working-Class Eye of Milton Rogovin: A Retrospective Essay," *New Labor Forum,* City University of New York, Mar. 4, 2011, https://newlaborforum.cuny.edu/2011/03/04/the-working-class-eye-of-milton-rogovin-a-retrospective-photo-essay/.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Ibid.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Milton Rogovin & Pablo Neruda *Windows That Open Inward : Images of Chile*, (Buffalo: White Pine Press, 1999), 12; Nancy Morejón, Nancy and Milton Rogovin, *With Eyes and Soul: Images of Cuba*, (Buffalo: White Pine Press, 2004), 14.

[21] Thomas Bender & Wilson Smith, *American Higher Education Transformed 1940-2005,* (Baltimore, Maryland: John Hopkins Press, 2008), 463.

[22] N.Y. C.L.S. Educ. § 3022; N.Y. C.L.S. Educ. § 3021.

[23] Marjorie Heins, *Priests of Our Democracy: The Supreme Court, Academic Freedom, & the*

Anti-Communist Purge. (New York University Press, 2013), 13.

[24] Gardner, interview.

[25] Kenneth C. Davis, "Standing, Ripeness and Civil Liberties: A Critique of Adler v. Board of Education." *American Bar Association Journal* 38, no. 11 (1952): 925. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25718219.

[26] *Adler v. Board of Education*, 342 U.S. 485, 490 (1952).

[27] Ibid., 491.

[28] Heins, 224.

[29] Ibid.

[30] Ibid.

[31] Feinberg Oath & Statements, University Archives, University at Buffalo, 1965.

[32] Heins, 224.

[33] Ibid., 225.

[34] Ibid.

[35] Ibid.

[36] Ibid.

[37] Ibid., 17.

[38] Ibid.

[39] Ibid.

[40] Jeremy Young & Clare Carter, "The Plaintiff Who Secured Academic Freedom Sees Echoes of the 'Red Scare' Today," *Pen America*, Jan. 2, 2025, https://pen.org/the-plaintiff-who-secured-academic-freedom-sees-echoes-of-red-scare-today/.

[41] Heins, 227.

[42] Ibid., 229.

[43] Ibid.

[44] Ibid.

[45] Heins, 227.

[46] Ibid., 228.

[47] Ibid.

[48] Maud to Associate Dean Myles Slatin, 1/13/1964, Buff-Lipsitz, 1:1.23.

[49] Young & Carter, "The Plaintiff."

[50] Heins, 228.

[51] Richard Sandomir, "Harry Keyishian, Lead Plaintiff in Academic Freedom Case, Dies at 93," *New York Times* (New York), Apr. 19, 2026.

[52] Ibid.

[53] Ibid.

[54] Young & Carter, "The Plaintiff,"

[55] Ibid.

[56] Richard Lipsitz, *Distinguished Alumni Award*, University at Buffalo, School of Law, May 3, 2007.

[57] Ibid.

[58] Ibid.

[59] Ibid.

[60] Richard Lipsitz, (President Emeritus of Western New York Labor Federation, Lipsitz's Son) interview by Ryan Harrington at Snyder Spot Coffee, Sept. 23, 2026.

[61] Ibid.

[62] Ibid.

[63] Ibid.

[64] Heins, 238.

[65] Ibid.

[66] Ibid.

[67] Young & Carter, "The Plaintiff."

[68] Ibid.

[69] Heins, 233.

[70] Ibid.

[71] Ibid.

[72] Ibid., 240.

[73] Ibid.

[74] Ibid., 211.

[75] Ibid., 212.

[76] Ibid., 211.

[77] "Keyishian v. Board of Regents of Univ. of State of NY," *Oyez*. Accessed September 17, 2026. https://www.oyez.org/cases/1966/105.

[78] Nan Haynes (UB Legal Writing Professor, Lipsitz's Daughter) interview by Ryan Harrington, Zoom, Sept. 20, 2026.

[79] Heins, 212.

[80] Ibid.

[81] Ibid.

[82] Ibid., 603.

[83] *Keyishian v. Board of Regents*, 385 U.S. 589, 601 (1967)

[84] Ibid.

[85] Ibid., 598.

[86] Ibid., 627.

[87] Ibid., 606.

[88] Ibid., 602.

[89] Keyishian, 385 U.S. 628 (Clark dissenting).

[90] Heins, 216.

[91] Ibid., 217.

[92] Ibid., 219.

[93] Ibid.

[94] Harry Keyishian, *Harry Keyishian Papers*, University Archives, 1952.

[95] David R. Pfalzgraf, *An Appraisal of Security Legislation in Education in Light of Keyishian: A Proposed Solution*, 16 Buffalo Law Review 781, 798 (1967).

[96] N.Y. State Senate, *State University Standards*, S.10303, (2026). https://legislation.nysenate.gov/pdf/bills/2025/S10303.

[97] Gardner, interview.

[98] Ibid.

[99] Gardner, interview.

[100] Ibid.

[101] Ibid., 245.

[102] *Urofsky v. Gilmore*, 216 F.3d 401, 428 (4th Cir. 2000).

[103] Ibid., 430.

[104] Heins, 245.

[105] *Urofsky v. Gilmore,* 531 U.S. 1070 (2001).

[106] Haynes, interview.

[107] Young & Carter, "The Plaintiff."

[108] Young & Carter, "The Plaintiff."

[109] Ibid.

[110] Ibid.

[111] Haynes, interview.

[112] Ibid.

[113] Lipsitz, interview.

[114] Ibid.

[115] Ibid.

[116] Ibid.

[117] Lipsitz, interview.

[118] Russo, "Canisius University Faculty and Students Hit Picket Line."

[119] Ibid.

[120] Tanya Loughead, *Critical University: Moving Higher Education Forward*, (Lexington Books, 2015), 79.