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CHAPTER I

ACADEMIC FREEDOM--TRADITION AND CONCEPT

Scholars have always considered free inquiry to be essential to the effective search for truth and, hence, have always held academic freedom in high esteem. This tradition, often questioned by non-scholars, has recently come under an extensive re-examination in the United States. The vagaries of the international Communist movement have led to various forms of reaction, including a tendency to repress thought. Indeed, a confluence of forces (namely, the democratic commitment to a changing society and the Communist commitment to the use of dubious methods in the creation of a changed society) has led to a situation which has threatened the tradition of academic freedom from the left, the right, and the center.

There are some in the profession who claim that the test of our faith in the tradition depends upon a willingness to maintain some Communists in the classrooms of America. Others, equally dedicated to the tradition, insist that the only way to preserve it is to exclude all Communist Party members from teaching positions. As if this conflict within the profession were not enough, some legislative investigations into matters concerning education have been conducted,
allegedly, in defense of academic freedom. A tradition which arouses such ambivalent emotions in diverse groups needs careful examination.

Like many other noble concepts, "academic freedom" fails to convey specific meaning—in fact, it has many meanings. To the man in the street the tradition probably implies a kind of scholarly consideration of all points of view. The pluralistic nature of Western culture is perhaps one reason for the vagueness of this view; yet this same pluralism has contributed mightily to the more specific definitions which in time came to form a part of the tradition's rich folklore. The rise of the scientific method is another important factor, also, that aided the evolution of the liberal tradition of intellectual freedom in Western society. Each factor must be examined if we are to discover the part it has played in underscoring a need for free inquiry.

Western Pluralism

In the ancient Greek states numerous philosophies competed for the minds of men. Some saw reality as eternal, immutable, immovable, and indivisible; others declared that nothing was fixed save the law of change itself. Some of the Sophists insisted that "justice was the interest of the stronger"—Socrates, on the other hand, associated virtue with knowledge. The Epicureans developed (to varying degrees)
a hedonistic point of view, while the Stoics introduced a more austere and puritanical strain into Greek thought.

Numerous ways for settling the conflicts between differing views could have been suggested—and were. Pericles, to his credit, is alleged to have said that "... instead of looking upon discussion as a stumbling-block in the way of action, we think it an indispensable preliminary to any wise action at all." William G. Carleton believes that the balance of forces within a pluralistic culture conspire to foster such libertarian concepts. He has said that

Greek thinking, then, resulted in a wide diversity of ideas. And this multiplicity of philosophies and values has come down to Western civilization to make that civilization widely diverse and pluralistic in its thinking—and therefore an essentially libertarian civilization. The peoples of Western Europe have had many philosophies from which to choose; and these various philosophies and value-systems have checked one another and resulted in a relatively large measure of tolerance and freedom. Since the time of the Greeks, Western civilization has been pluralistic—in some periods more pluralistic than others—and hence uncongenial to monolithic systems and congenial to liberty.1

One period less pluralistic than others was the Middle Ages. The monolithic prescriptions of the Roman Church were then influential throughout Europe. It is easy to exaggerate this influence, however, because evolving Christian

1C-1 Staff, Syllabus, Comprehensive Course C-1, American Institutions, Part II, C-12 (Gainesville: University of Florida, 1956), p. 355.
doctrine was not unaffected, during its earlier development, by existing ideologies. Reisner states:

Into the simple religious teaching of Jesus had infiltrated, during the three centuries following his death, a technical metaphysical system which was the heritage, not from Sinai nor from Calvary, but from Athens and Alexandria, . . . 2

The monolithic influence of the medieval church was vitiated by the developing cultures of later periods, also. The powers of the feudal lord and those of the king often provided powerful alternatives to Papal thought. The reverse is also true, as Richard O'Sullivan has pointed out.

The existence of the Catholic Church and the distinction it makes between the spiritual and the temporal powers sets a barrier to the totalitarian aspirations of the State. The natural tendency of civil rulers is to exaggerate their power, and to remove or to ignore all limitations on it. . . . The effort of civil rulers, even of Christian rulers, has constantly been to reduce the Church to obedience to their will. Christian history is full of the conflict between Papacy and Empire, between Church and State.3

The gradual evolution of modern states out of feudal Europe aided, and was in turn aided by, the Protestant Reformation. The religious changes which occurred during the Reformation involved a break with internationally centralized theology in favor of a more national, local, or individualized


form. Protestants, believing in "the priesthood of the individual soul," became the champions of education and a vernacular Bible. It was their purpose to make it possible for individuals to learn to read and thus be able to understand God's plan for themselves.

The Reformation created a great schism in Christianity and eventually, especially as the United States of America developed, hundreds of competing denominations evolved. This institutional development, coupled as it was with an emphasis on individual responsibility, represented a considerable gain in the possibility of free choice.

When we turn to the American scene we find an unusual diversity in all aspects of life—climate, topography, occupation, race, national origin, political opinion, and religious beliefs. This wide pluralism did not always exist, and while many may see in it a reasonable ground for the tradition of free inquiry, it has not always been a sure ground. To understand the role diversity has played in creating the grounds for, and the problems confronting, free inquiry in the United States we may fruitfully examine certain aspects of American history and government.

The Puritans came to America to secure religious freedom but they seemed no more inclined to tolerate error, upon securing their opportunity, than did the Orthodox Church from which they had fled. The experiences of Thomas Hooker, Anne Hutchinson, and Roger Williams testify to the authoritarian
character of early New England leaders. The influence of Protestant dogma was felt also in the founding and orthodox control of such early colleges as Harvard and Yale. Presidents like Mather and Clapp demanded such orthodoxy in thought that conflicts eventually developed which threatened the colleges with the loss not only of good instructors but of paying students as well. Such a situation, confounded by the settlement of people of other religious persuasion within the community, led to a relaxing of the autocratic demands of the early presidents. Gradually a spirit of doctrinal tolerance developed which was perhaps best expressed by Roger Williams: "I acknowledge that to molest any person, Jew or Gentile, for either professing doctrine, or practicing worship . . . is to persecute him . . . ."$^4$

The experience of the early colleges with religious diversity provided the founders of the Republic with a lesson in governmental organization which they put to good use. As Alexander Hamilton stated,

In a free government the security for civil rights must be the same as that for religious rights. It consists in the one case in the multiplicity of interests, and in the other of the multiplicity of sects. The degree of security in both cases will depend on the number of interests and sects; . . .$^5$


Just as the church and state were separated by the constitution so government itself was restrained by a series of checks and balances. Local, state, and national governments were given different, and often prescribed, powers. The national government was divided into three branches and, thus, in theory, no single government or branch of government could wield a final authority over the minds of men. One finds, also, in the structure of American Government, arrangements which were intended to equalize the power between small states and big ones, and between rural and urban areas.

The subsequent development of political parties promised (at least, in theory) a competition of ideas between the parties in the public forum. Within the parties, too, the vast sectional and ideological differences of the country have been adjusted by debate, modification, and compromise, either in the platforms drawn up or in the persons of the candidates chosen. One may well argue that such debates have contributed little to inquiry and have led instead to emotional appeals that have forced compromise, so to speak, at political gunpoint. Yet one must at least admit that they have led to a dawning awareness on the part of all concerned that there are other points of view which may win out unless they are refuted, and the realization on the part of many that other points of view have a measure of merit.

With the continued advance of the industrial and scientific revolutions, it must be noted, legislators and
administrators have been increasingly forced to rely on the advice of numerous technical experts in the development of economic, foreign, military, and other policies. Former President Harry S. Truman, in defending one of his professional consultants, remarked:

Advisers, to be of value, must feel that what they say or write will be held in confidence; that the man or the office they advise will appreciate the fact that they are expressing opinions and that, probably, they are not the only ones asked for opinions and advice. The minute an effort is made to challenge that decision after it has been made and to determine whether the opinions or the advice on which it was made was "right" (with retribution and criticism for those who are not "right"), independent thought which alone produces sound decisions will be stymied or killed.6

The need for uncoerced professional advice from many sources in formulating grand strategy is clearly stated in this quotation but, equally, the need for the exchange of expert knowledge, also needed in matters which are less grand and obvious, is set forth. The recent development of a polio vaccine illustrates a tendency toward intellectual cooperation which undergirds many aspects of modern democratic life. T. V. Smith points to other areas as well:

We have our bread for today and even for tomorrow, come what may. But what of next year? Failure of harvest for a single season over a large area imperils a nation; and two general crop failures in succession would darken every human door with the gaunt shadow of primeval hunger. If such a

---

6Life, Excerpts from The Truman Memoirs, Part IV, February 13, 1956, p. 93.
failure is unlikely, then it is so only because of the advances in scientific agriculture made possible by a growing intellectual cooperation of men friendly disposed toward one another and one another's work. Crops or no crops, a complete tie-up of our transportation system would in three months' time bring our proudest metropolis to its knees.\footnote{T. V. Smith and Edward C. Lindeman, *The Democratic Way of Life* (A Mentor Book; New York: The New American Library, 1951), p. 38.}

In the hurly-burly of life today one must raise some questions about the extent of this "growing intellectual cooperation." In some areas of public life scientific knowledge has found wide acceptance but in the areas most vital to social and political decision-making, power factors, supported by blind opinion and uncriticized habit, are often as decisive as intelligence.

In a pluralistic society each person (or organization or institution) often has to be satisfied with a partial attainment of desired objectives. The perfect achievement of grand plans is possible, if it ever is, only by dictators. Compromise, by various means, often called the special genius of American democracy, is the alternative to the open clash of opposing powers. Henry Clay once said:

All legislation, all government, all society is founded upon the principle of mutual concession, politeness, comity, courtesy; upon these everything is based. . . . Let him who elevates himself above humanity, above its weakness, its infirmities, its wants, its necessities, say, if he pleases, I will never compromise; but let no one who is not above
the frailties of our common nature disdain compromise.8

Our wide diversity provides a good ground for the tradition of free inquiry when no intransigent group is sufficiently powerful to dominate the scene. But the question of how far to go in compromising with ignorance and authoritarianism does arise. There are, of course, in the ideological spectrum various kinds of authoritarian positions that seek converts. While there appears little chance that an authoritarian group will be able to attain a majority position in this culture, any threat on this score suggests to many that it would be suicidal for a free people to tolerate the error that would destroy them.

One may indeed argue that when confronted with such diversity as is found in Western culture, all sides should be heard before "making up one's mind." But having heard all sides how is a decision to be made? This question brings us to the second historical development which has played an influential role in the evolution of the tradition of academic freedom.

The Rise of Science

During the Renaissance there was an intellectual rebirth of ancient learning and humanism which had long been

buried in the theological disputations of scholasticism. The scholars, who came to be known as humanists, had grown restive under increasing orthodoxy and as they saw it, the meaninglessness of theological "knowledge." Most humanists were not interested in creating a schism in Christianity, such as the Reformation later produced, nor a break with religion, such as some scientists later made. They were, for the most part, simply interested in breathing renewed life into an institution which was apparently suffering from arteriosclerosis. Erasmus said:

You will not be damned if you do not know whether the Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son has one or two beginnings, but you will not escape damnation if you do not cultivate the fruits of the Spirit which are love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, long-suffering, mercy, faith, modesty, continence, and chastity.\(^9\)

The effect of humanistic learning, however, was to turn men's minds in the direction of their earthly existence. The literature and art of the ancient world were studied intently and out of this grew a renewed concern for the "golden mean between extremes." Balance and moderation in all things were encouraged. Renaissance thinkers were instrumental in developing classical liberal learning and advocates of this type of education have often guided the organization of some of the best liberal arts colleges.

While the humanists were "anti-intellectual" in their attitude toward some phases of scholastic learning, the methods evolved in some of their research on original documents and artifacts of the ancient world may have converged with other forces to produce a situation in which a scientific approach to knowledge could emerge.

There had been some development of science among the Greeks, but one of their great limitations was a failure to realize the potential enrichment which accrues both to theory and practice when the two are brought together. The shortcomings of a citizen class built on a slave economy were undoubtedly responsible for much of this lack of insight. Angus Armitage states the case nicely and indicates the point of view which, during the period of the Renaissance and Reformation, gradually dawned on the minds of an increasing number of men. Of the early Greek science and crafts Armitage says:

These were the crafts roughly corresponding to what is now the science of chemistry. They were laborious crafts, involving the use of fire, and carried on by grimy, unlettered workers, from whom the Greek thinkers were almost completely cut off by their social position. Hence the chemical theory of the Greeks was a fiasco; that was a price they paid for neglecting the rich stores of knowledge about the stuff of the world which these humble craftsmen had accumulated through so many centuries.

On the other hand, the great rise of modern science in the last three hundred years dates from the time when men discovered that such
knowledge must provide the raw material of science. The scientist has continually to go back to experience through the experiments he performs in his laboratory, in order to keep his thinking on the right lines.\(^\text{10}\)

During the middle of the Sixteenth Century, Copernicus, a Catholic with humanistic leanings, was taking readings of the elevations of the moon and planets against the background of the "fixed" stars and of the sun at its meridian point. Out of the data he thus gathered with crude instruments at various points over a number of years, Copernicus eventually evolved the theory of a revolving earth in a heliocentric universe. He published his theory in a book called \textit{De Revolutionibus Orbium Caelestium} during the last year of his life. Protestants at first denounced it because it did not square with certain statements in the Bible and Catholics later objected to it because Aristotle (whose word was law on such matters) had made no mention of such a view.

But the revolution in man's approach to knowledge was under way. Tycho Brahe, with better instruments, collected data for many years; and, although he did not confirm the theory of Copernicus or develop one of his own before he died, his assistant did. John Kepler's struggle with theories, and with the data collected by Brahe, is so illustrative of the public nature of scientific method and the

faith which men have come to place in the process that part of his story is quoted here.

That was how Tycho Brahe's unrivaled series of observations of the planets came into the hands of the one man in the world, perhaps, who could have unraveled a new planetary theory from them. Kepler tried to reduce the observed motion of the planet Mars to a rule. He began while Tycho was alive, and carried on as his successor after his death. He tried at first to represent the planet's motion by means of the same geometrical "dodges" earlier astronomers had employed--the excentric circle and the rest. By these means he succeeded in fitting the theoretical to the actual motion of the planet so closely that they never disagreed by more than about a quarter of the apparent breadth of the full Moon. But Kepler thought so highly of Tycho's accuracy that he could not imagine him being wrong by even so much as that. So he scrapped all the work he had done on these lines, though it had meant four years of tedious calculation.11

Kepler eventually adopted Copernicus' views and improved and corrected them by creating his own three laws of planetary motion. From the structure of these laws Newton later evolved his law of gravitation.

Galileo fashioned a telescope and his discovery of a universe in microcosm (that of Jupiter and its moons) lent support to the theories of Copernicus--support which Galileo was later forced to deny. But neither scholastic argument nor papal decree was to have the final word in these matters. Scientists gradually found ways to demonstrate the truth or untruth of many of their theories by tests open to the

experience of all. And, though it took some time, Copernicus' theory was one of these.

In the 1800's Leon Foucault pointed out that a pendulum always swings in the same plane and that if the earth were stationary, a long pendulum would constantly traverse the same path over a floor. If, on the other hand, the earth were rotating, the pendulum's path would gradually describe a partial turn (clockwise in the northern hemisphere and counterclockwise in the southern). This experiment led to a conclusion that the earth rotated on its axis, and its revolution about the sun was confirmed in 1838 when F. W. Bessel observed an annual parallax shift in the position of the star 61 Cygni.

The histories of men like Copernicus, Brahe, Kepler, Galileo, and Bessel not only introduce us to the struggles and problems of early scientists, but depict, also, the gradual perfecting of the scientific method itself. Armed with it, men had a new tool to aid them in their search for truth. Many times this new tool led to conclusions which were in conflict with ancient tradition or religious myths. While these conflicts led to temporary disagreements between science and religion, they were more often resolved by reinterpretation of religious ideas or by other findings of science which seemed to support particular religious views, such as some evidence of an ancient flood. For many years the two truths walked hand in hand, and many scientists
seemed to believe they were thinking the thoughts of God after Him.

The mechanistic universe of Newton provided the ground upon which scientists evolved a correspondence theory of truth. According to this theory the findings and ideas of science were envisioned as discoveries of a pre-existent order and reality. To many people the discovery of this reality and of appropriate laws was a further proof of God's existence and his rationality. True science and true religion, they argued, could not be in conflict, and the influence and scope of science continued to grow.

It was not until Darwin's theory of evolution was set forth in The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection that a deep conflict again developed between scientific and religious opinion. While in educational history the controversy over Darwin's theory was neither as violent nor as drawn out as the one over a heliocentric universe, it did reach polemic proportions on both sides. Bishop Wilberforce inquired, "Is it on his grandfather's or his grandmother's side that the ape ancestry comes in?" And as late as 1924 William Jennings Bryan observed that the scientists seemed "more concerned with the age of rocks than the 'Rock of Ages.'" On the side of the scientists John Trowbridge had written in the Popular Science Monthly:

A minister lives apart from the seething turmoil and progress of the scientific world; and, if he should attempt to dispute with innovators, he will
meet the same fate as any comparative recluse who attempts to dictate to the world from his retirement.12

The faith, the challenge, and the attitude of some scientists and laymen, regarding the scientific method, are illustrated in the above quotation. But it must be noted that not all who were interested in the advance of scientific method were so positive about its findings or caustic in their public utterances. Charles Sanders Pierce, William James, and John Dewey were gradually evolving a theory of truth based on consequences rather than on correspondence. Such a view tended to take the dogmatism out of scientific method, leading Dewey to the conclusion finally that it was better to claim no more than "warranted assertibility" for ideas than to assert "the truth" had been discovered.

The evolutionary debate, however, marked a turning point in the nature and qualifications of American higher education. The question of scientific competence became increasingly important as a professional qualification and was hailed as a great libertarian victory over mysticism and dogma. There was (according to Hofstadter and Metzger) a gradual exodus of the clergy from boards of trustees and from administrative and faculty positions during the next 50 years.13

12John Trowbridge, quoted in Hofstadter and Metzger, op. cit., p. 348.

13Hofstadter and Metzger, op. cit., p. 352.
We may say, then, that scientific method played an important part in checking the clerical domination of colleges and universities and in providing men with a more exacting tool in their search for knowledge. The methods and findings of science are open for public examination and its developing ideas and facts frequently demand teamwork over many years. F. Bronowski says of it,

To listen to everyone; to silence no one; to honour and promote those who are right, these have given science its power in our world, and its humanity. Don't be deceived by those who say that science is narrow; a narrow, bigoted power is as brittle as Himmler's. Have you been told that science is dogmatic? There is not a field of science which has not been made over from top to bottom in the last fifty years. Science has filled our world because it has been tolerant and flexible and endlessly open to new ideas. In the best sense of that difficult word, science is a democratic method.  

Most of us have formed our notions about academic freedom and the present Communist issue in terms of the pluralistic culture in which we live and in relationship to the importance of science in our lives. The arguments advanced in a particular crisis, however, are reflections of the past and they are used with little reference to the context in which they were originally advanced. "We need our modern doubting Thomases" someone proclaims. Another reminds us to "seek ye the truth" and urges "tolerance" on the ground that one should love one's enemies. Others insist that all ideas

---

14 The Western Tradition, op. cit., p. 55.
must stand "the test of time" or "compete in the free market." At other times, teachers are advised either to "teach only the facts capable of verification" or to "seek the golden mean."

The writer is well aware of the fact that many of these ideas were not originally intended to convey the meaning which most of us presently attach to free inquiry. Here, as is the case with many other concepts which give meaning to life, neat syllogisms can get in the way. Concepts become detached from their original context and are used for the needs and purposes at hand. H. Gordon Hullfish in discussing concept formation speaks of them as "suggested objects." He says,

These suggested objects are real existences; they are stimuli which the organism strives to complete. They are real objects, but they are, as Dewey says, "the real objects which they are and not some other objects." They are, in short, the objects of reflection. Thinking consists in just this process of finding, or detaching, meanings and reorganizing the situation to test, or prove, them. These objects become, in turn, the tools we use in directing our future inquiries . . .

Concepts are an essential tool of all thinking but they may, depending on the way they are used, limit vision even as they direct it. While one may very well be justified in "pouring new wine into old wineskins," a careful analysis of the

---

present-day threat to academic freedom may show that new concepts are in order. It is, as Hullfish suggests, to the "situation" one must look—and traditional arguments form only a part of this.

In Chapters II and III the nature of the Communist movement as one new aspect in the situation will be developed. Part of the present confusion about academic freedom, however, may be clarified when the views of two fairly distinct positions regarding it are developed. Each of these two views, which for lack of better terms will be called the "classical" and "professional competence" positions, champions academic freedom.

The Classical Position

In the classical position truth is expected to work its way to supremacy through a competition in the market place of ideas. John Milton described the struggle beautifully in his *Areopagitica*:

And though all the windes of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so Truth be in the field, we do injuriously by licencing and prohibiting to misdoubt her strength. Let her and Falsehood grapple; who ever knew Truth put to the worse, in a free and open encounter?\(^\text{16}\)

Pursuing the same line of thought, John Stuart Mill argued that it is not enough for a person to learn about an

opponent's view through the eyes and refutations of a teacher who does not himself hold the view under discussion. Mill says:

That is not the way to do justice to the arguments, or to bring them into real contact with his own mind. He must be able to hear them from persons who actually believe them; who defend them in earnest, and do their very utmost for them. He must know them in their most plausible and persuasive form; he must feel the whole force of the difficulty which the true view of the subject has to encounter and dispose of; else he will never really possess himself of the portion of truth which meets and removes that difficulty.¹⁷

As Joseph K. Hart has noted, "education goes on whether school keeps or not," and it may be pointed out that the idea of "truth-getting" as ideas compete in the marketplace is at least as directly related to political and social institutions as it is to education--possibly more so. Around election time one may hear observations such as these: "I listen to both sides and then I make up my mind" or "I suspect both parties have part of the truth--I'm independent." From business one catches part of the idea in the advertising which encourages the consumer to "compare our product with other leading brands and see for yourself."

The professional advocates of the classical position seem to believe that the search for truth requires the unrestricted right to seek the truth and to teach it as

discovered. The student is expected to make up his own mind, after having been exposed to various views of and approaches to truth. Whether the prospective teacher believes truth to be absolute, relative, or unknowable is not, in this position, a professional block to employment. From a methodological view one may believe in revelation, in logical deduction from self-evident principles in Hegelian or materialistic dialectics, in scientific method based on either a correspondence or a consequences theory of truth, etc. The only professional concern is that arguments be presented with inspiration and politeness and that they be scholarly and objective (in the sense of careful and logical).

A report of a special committee of the American Association of University Professors in 1956 adopted a view of educational purposes which is in line with the classical position. The 1956 report seems to indicate that schools should be left open to all points of view—even the most despised. The report states:

Much of the non-Communist world proceeds without excluding from the teaching profession avowed Communists, provided they are not active conspirators, and it seems out of keeping with the free traditions and present strength of the United States for our policy to be craven and timid....

To maintain a healthy state of thought and opinion in this country, it is desirable for adherents of Communism, like those of other forms of revolutionary thought, to present their views, especially in colleges and universities, so that they may be checked by open discussion. How else
are Americans to know the nature of the ideologi­cal currents in their world? If representatives of Communism from abroad were to be employed under an exchange program in American institutions of higher learning, as has been proposed, the unwisdom of the present academic policy would quickly become evident. We urge that American colleges and universities return to a full-scale acceptance of intellectual controversy based on a catholicity of viewpoint, for the sake of national strength as well as for academic reasons.18

Such a firm professional endorsement of the classical position has been rather rare since the issue of scientific competence was raised following the Darwinian disputes of the last century. Indeed, this quotation seems to show a considerable shift in emphasis from the position taken by the Association in its original 1915 "Declaration of Purposes."

While the classical position has played a lesser role within professional circles since the last century, many students still proclaim it boldly. The "Ohio State Lantern," a student publication, discussing the Rugg Incident19 in an editorial entitled "Let Us Hear!" said,

Dr. Rugg may well be "a doctrinaire propagandist rather than an educator? . . . but let us hear a doctrinaire propagandist. And let us hear a pacifist and a Communist and a Socialist and a Democrat and a Republican . . . and then let us judge.20


19In 1951 Harold Rugg had spoken at the Ohio State University and after considerable uproar in the local press the Board of Trustees initiated a "screening program" for all prospective speakers.

21Ohio State Lantern (Columbus), October 5, 1951, p. 4.
The classical position requires a balanced presentation of opposing views within the institution; and, in this Gestalt or context, the student may listen and seek for himself as his beliefs are challenged. Critical thinking thus becomes an indispensable tool of the student and its nature and development largely his responsibility. Independent thinking, then, is more the hope and responsibility of the total institution and the individual student than a requirement of faculty competence. Dwight L Bolinger has remarked:

If only intellectually free people were allowed to teach, the profession would be depopulated; it is a good thing that our intellectual purists are not really trying to rid their ranks of all who might have pledged a part of their minds in some tawdry pawnshop of prejudice. Complete intellectual freedom exists in the imagination of administrators on special occasions, such as the laying of cornerstones and appearances before boards of regents, but at no fixed or movable point in the real world.21

The Professional Competence Position

Members of all professions concern themselves with standards of competence in their specialized fields of knowledge. This is no less true of educators, although their field embraces a wide horizon. The idea of professional competence can perhaps trace its roots to a Periclean concern for "wise" action. With the improvement of scientific methods, a formidable conception of competence developed. The Copernican and Darwinian debates shook traditional beliefs to their very

foundation. Charles Eliot of Harvard, speaking of the scientific method, declared,

The achievements of scientific inquirers, animated by this spirit of sincerity and truth, have been so extraordinary within the past sixty years . . . that the educated world has accepted it as the only true inspiration of research. . . . No other method of inquiry now commands respect. . . . Protestant theologians and ministers must rise to that standard, if they would continue to command the respect of mankind.22

The prestige of science among American educators was pervasive not only because it was a productive instrument of research but also because it was becoming (as was noted earlier) a vehicle which eventually helped to break the long clerical domination of education. The idea of disciplined scientific inquiry prescribed the limits of public truth to those things which were empirically verifiable. Every person had an equal right to his pet theories and private opinions but they had to be acknowledged for what they were. Under the glaring light of scientific examination ideas were by no means considered equal. Truth was to be the result not of a free and unrestrained competition of ideas in the market but of a regulated competition between those ideas or parts of ideas which would submit to empirical testing. Hofstadter, in discussing the criterion of scientific competence, says . . . it makes fewer allowances for vagaries of opinion than do, say, the doctrines of Milton.

and Mill. In the modern theory, though no conclusion is unchallengeable, the method for arriving at conclusions is prescribed.  

In both public and professional circles some people were inclined to make science a sacred cow. To those who adhered to a correspondence theory of truth scientific method was envisioned as a means of discovering pre-existent reality, laws, and truth. While no one could be sure when all the facts were in, or a universal law discovered, there was no question about the ultimate and absolute nature of the facts and laws once it was concluded they had been finally discovered. Here was a view that could raise a tribunal of science that might become as zealous in guarding the truth as was the Inquisition.

The pragmatic school of William James and John Dewey was inclined to a view of science which made its pronouncements in less dogmatic terms. Truth to these men was not discovered but created in the act of testing ideas within a process of inquiry that subjected the ideas to a specific check of the consequences they promised. The truth, then, was to be determined by the actual results, in a problem situation, of action which flowed from the ideas put forward as proposed solutions. Even when an hypothesis was validated, it suggested no universal application, since consequences often change from one situation to the next. Truth, then,

---

was relative and science at best could yield only "warranted assertibility."

Despite these distinctions there is no doubt that science and its method had become a primary consideration of professional competence during the early years of the twentieth century. In 1915 the American Association of University Professors issued a "Declaration of Principles" which emphasized the desirability of scientific competence and objectivity within the profession. The Declaration states:

To the degree that professional scholars, in the formation and promulgation of their opinions, are, or by the character of their tenure appear to be, subject to any motive other than their own scientific conscience and a desire for the respect of their fellow-experts, to that degree the university teaching profession is corrupted; its proper influence upon public opinion is diminished and viti­ated; and society at large fails to get from its scholars, in an unadulterated form, the peculiar and necessary service which it is the office of the professional scholar to furnish.24

And further,

If this profession should prove itself unwilling to purge its ranks of the incompetent and the unworthy, or to prevent the freedom which it claims in the name of science from being used as a shelter for inefficiency, for superficiality, or for uncritical and intemperate partisanship, it is certain that the task will be performed by others . . .25


25 Ibid., pp. 105-106.
Some (though by no means all) within the pragmatic school of thought have been reluctant to make scientific method the dominant criterion of professional competence. They feel that such an action, regardless of intention, forces all to fall prostrate before the altar of science and unwittingly plays into the hands of those who advocate a correspondence theory of truth. Other pragmatists (Sidney Hook, for instance) feel the consequences of such a step are less dangerous to education than the actions and effects of teachers who adhere to Communist Party dogma.

The split within and between the schools of scientific thought may help explain why the language of the 1915 American Association of University Professors "Declaration of Principles" is equivocal at certain points. After placing a strong emphasis on "professional responsibility" and the "spirit and methods of science" as a measure of that quality, the authors seem to hedge at a critical point. The report says,

> The liberty of the scholar within the university to set forth his conclusions, be they what they may, is conditioned by their being conclusions gained by a scholar's method and held in a scholar's spirit; that is to say, they must be the fruits of competent and patient and sincere inquiry, and they should be set forth with dignity, courtesy, and temperateness of language.26

The looseness of such terms as "scholar's method," "spirit" and "sincere inquiry" are perhaps indicative of a lack of

\[26\text{Ibid., pp. 104-05. (My italics.)}\]
unanimity regarding the nature of the scholar's method. It is true, nevertheless, that the 1915 declaration generally supports the idea of scientific competence. The 1925 and 1940 reports are less clear on this point.

Science undoubtedly played a great part in clearing the educational profession of some of the worst anachronisms of medieval dogma. With the rise of fascism and communism new and more directly powerful dogmas threatened education whenever exponents of the ideologies came into political ascendancy. Even in the countries where the modern totalitarians were unsuccessful, education, along with other social institutions, was threatened by "infiltration."

The Communists and Fascists made a mockery of science by covering up some facts, distorting others, and, in general, creating so much confusion, as emotional responses were stirred, that they were often able to pose as champions of science. Under such conditions many educators have turned to the creed of the New School of Social Research, citing it as a plan of action which not only meets the present needs but also squares with the American educational tradition. The creed states that "no member of the Faculty can be a member of any political group which asserts the right to dictate in matters of science or scientific opinion."27

Educators who stress professional competence based on scientific method feel that the latter is a precise, flexible, and unbiased tool of research and truth. They do not want it or its products misused, distorted, or discounted by dogma of any sort. These educators champion academic freedom just as fervently as do those representing the classical position. They would undoubtedly proclaim with the classicists and Jefferson:

>If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it.  


The point to note here is that reason must be left free to combat error, and this qualification, the members of the professional-competence school would say, has not been met when a Communist Party member teaches. Neither the teacher's own mind nor the minds of his students, under such conditions, are free.

In the professional-competence school of thought, free and independent thinking on the part of students is not achieved in an institutional spectrum of competing and frequently dogmatic ideas advanced by exponents of the ideas, but at the feet of teachers whose own minds are free from dogma. Freemindedness, achieved by the use of the methods
of science (or of the scholar), becomes a requirement for each faculty member. The institution need not permit the presentation of all views by their advocates. It may, however, and, indeed, should teach objectively about them. Heresy will be tolerated; conspiracy will not be, as Sidney Hook has emphasized in his book _Heresy, Yes--Conspiracy, No_. The advocates of this view would disagree with Mill's statement that "both teachers and learners go to sleep at their post, as soon as there is no enemy in the field."²⁹

The Complications

The modern university is an aggregation of scientists, technicians, craftsmen, accountants, physicians, engineers, lawyers, and instructors in all important fields of knowledge. The institution frequently provides general and special education, as well as graduate study and research, and some form of extension service. Philosophically, teachers may be idealistic, realistic, materialistic, naturalistic, pragmatic, or agnostic. All of this is, of course, true, to varying degrees, in the lower institutions as well. One may seriously ask what manner of common agreement may be reached on questions of competence, method, and freedom in a profession so diverse in its interests, purposes, personnel, techniques, and services.

The Harvard Report, *General Education in a Free Society*, published in 1945, offers one example of disagreement about educational purposes and truth-seeking by means of the scientific method. The report said,

... there is always a tendency in this type of thought to omit as irrelevant the whole realm of belief and commitment by which, to all appearance, much of human activity seems in fact swayed. ... The question at bottom is whether the scientific attitude is in truth applicable to the full horizon of life, and on this question there is, to say the least, uncertainty.30

Both the scientific and rationalistic approaches to life and truth are criticized by Bernard Meland. He feels that religious modes of thought are neglected by the daily emphasis on science and reason in the classrooms. Meland says:

I find myself persuaded in many respects by each of these views. Yet I am impelled to depart from both of them. For neither Dewey nor Hutchins seems to me to have an adequate measure of the human spirit. This is no easy matter to assess. Feelings as well as facts enter into such a judgment. Yet, one is guided, too, by the range of vision with which one fixes upon whatever is man's human or spiritual dimension. And on this ground, I find neither Dewey nor Hutchins, in their thinking upon education, inclusive of the sensibilities in man which would deepen and heighten his grasp of meaning, and, in fact, deepen and heighten the range of meanings as well. What I find lacking in each is a considered view of the appreciative consciousness as it operates upon the intellect, informing and sensitizing its nurture. Where the one depends upon problem-solving chiefly as an aid to thought,

---

the other rests upon the discipline of logical argument in the dialogue. 31

One may be inclined to dismiss this argument as the latter-day complaint of a dispossessed clergy, but it is also an indication that the classical idea of academic freedom has been poorly represented in the recent history of American education.

The liberal tradition of educational freedom has had a long and evolutionary history. Its origin, defenses, slogans, and meanings have been formed by various social conditions, institutions, and ideological points of view. When one adds to the pluralistic origin of the tradition today's multi-purpose institutional demands and needs, the confusion becomes understandable. It seems clear, however, that two fairly distinct positions have rallied under the banner of academic freedom and have attempted to give distinctive meanings to the ideas and professional requirements which are associated with free inquiry in the public and professional mind.

In the next chapter we will examine the critical new character of the educational situation brought on by the

---

nature of the Communist ideology and its methods of operation—in education and in social and political movements. In the view of many this ideology is now engaged in a struggle with the free world to gain control of men's minds.
CHAPTER II

THE COMMUNISTS AND EDUCATIONAL FREEDOM

"A specter is haunting Europe—the specter of communism." These words, written by Karl Marx over a century ago in the Communist Manifesto, were prophetic. Today communism is more than a specter and it harasses the minds of men throughout the entire world. The Soviet Union, the Chinese Republic, the satellite nations, and Yugoslavia represent real but varying forms and stages in the development of some of Marx's ideas concerning revolution and reconstructed society. Contrary to Marx's views the revolution has not been world wide, and it occurred first, not in the highly developed industrial nations, but in backward, feudal-agrarian areas of the world.

The restriction of the revolution to one culturally retarded country for many years has influenced the development of Communist ideas and the Communist state. This restriction has, for example, intensified the fear of Communist leaders about intervention and counter-revolution, and in turn, the fear of intervention has played a part in making the foreign policy of the Soviet Union alternately peaceful and aggressive.
The fact that the revolution did not spread to some industrial nation (e.g., Germany) after the First World War affected also the emphasis given to the development of Marxian ideas of the proletarian dictatorship. Having to build a highly developed science and technology, rather than having inherited one, the revolutionary party confronted a prolonged and difficult task. The revolutionary conquest of political power was one thing--the building of a social and technological revolution was another. The fears of intervention, of aloneness, and of backwardness have provided the Soviet leaders with an excuse and perhaps a reason for both their devious foreign policy and the intensification and prolongation of their totalitarianism.

If we are to understand the Marxian dogma fully, as it manifests itself today, and recognize its continuing threat to intellectual freedom, we must look beyond the fears that grew out of the particular conditions of the revolution to its philosophic roots and ultimate purposes, as these have lent themselves to interpretation and development.

Cosmology and Epistemology

The world outlook of communism is materialism dialectically conceived. Its major ideological opponent has been Idealism in its various philosophic and religious forms. Idealism, from the point of view of communism, invariably leads to inaction or improper action in economic social and
political life. Idealism forms a philosophic basis of that "opiate of the people" which numbs their senses to the outrages and discrepancies of the existing order by offering a compensatory and Utopian life in the hereafter.

A secondary opponent was the Empiro-Criticist school led by Ernst Mach (in Germany) and others. Mach, a deep student of scientific methodology, influenced the thinking of many early "logical positivists." The Empiro-Criticists were an anathema for Lenin who considered their views to be Idealism in disguise or, at best, a "shameful" and cowardly way of acknowledging materialism. Such a position, Lenin assumed, would also lead to inappropriate social and political action.

A third group the Marxists opposed was the Mechanistic Materialists whose views were considered inadequate because static and "non-dialectic." Newton's mechanistic views of the universe were considered far too "immutable" and in need of a "first cause."¹

The Marxists, first of all, envision a universe of matter in motion existing independently of a knower, the latter also materialistically conceived. Lenin explains it in the following words:

If colour is a sensation only depending upon the retina (as natural science compels you to admit), then light rays, falling upon the retina, produce

the sensation of colour. This means that outside us, independently of us and of our minds, there exists a movement of matter, let us say of ether waves of a definite length and of a definite velocity, which, acting upon the retina, produce in man the sensation of a particular colour. This is precisely how natural science regards it. It explains the sensations of various colours by the various lengths of light-waves existing outside the human retina, outside man and independently of him. This is materialism: matter acting upon our sense-organs produces sensation. Sensation depends on the brain, nerves, retina, etc., i.e., on matter organised in a definite way. The existence of matter does not depend on sensation. Matter is primary. Sensation, thought, consciousness [sic] are the supreme product of matter organised in a particular way. Such are the views of materialism in general, and of Marx and Engels in particular.

Materialism is not only the philosophy of Marxism but according to Lenin is the common-sense approach to life of all "healthy" individuals.

The "naive realism" of any healthy person who has not been an inmate of a lunatic asylum or a pupil of the idealist philosophers consists in the view that things, the environment, the world, exist independently of our sensation, of our consciousness, of our self and of man in general. . . . Our sensation, our consciousness is only an image of the external world, and it is obvious that an image cannot exist without the thing imaged, and that the latter exists independently of that which images it. Materialism deliberately makes the "naive" belief of mankind the foundation of its theory of knowledge.

The nature of the universe consists of matter in a state of constant flux, change, motion and development.

---


3Ibid., pp. 135-136.
There are no universal and immutable laws in physics, biology, or life except the laws of change itself. It is on this point that the materialistic views of the Marxist differ from the "older views" of Newtonian physics and gradual evolution by means of natural selection. The world exists and it is material but it is also moving and developing in a particular way—according to the "laws of motion," i.e., by means of struggle and sudden transformation or "leaps." Lenin says:

Development is the "struggle" of opposites. The two basic . . . conceptions of development (evolution) are: development as decrease and increase, as repetition, and development as a unity of opposites (the division of the one into mutually exclusive opposites and their reciprocal relation).

In the first conception of motion, self-movement, its driving force, its source, its motive, remains in the shade (or this source is made external—God, subject, etc.). In the second conception it is to the knowledge of the source of self-movement that attention is chiefly directed.

The first conception is lifeless, poor and dry. The second is vital. The second alone furnishes the key to the "self-movement" of everything in existence; it alone furnishes the key to the "leaps," to the break in continuity, "to the "transformation into the opposite," to the destruction of the old and the emergence of the new.

The unity (coincidence, identity, resultant) of opposites is conditional, temporary, transitory, relative. The struggle of mutually exclusive opposites is absolute, just as development and motion are absolute.  

4 Ibid., pp. 81-82.
This is the theoretical heart of communist materialism. Lenin studied Marx's and Engel's views of the dialectics of nature all his life and consistently explored its implications for physics, biology, psychology and for social and political action. Stalin was also a student of materialist dialectics and urged all party members to devote more time to this pursuit. He called it "... the world outlook of the Marxist-Leninist party."\(^5\) Mao Tse-tung has studied the laws of dialectics and, indeed, has lectured on and written about them for many years. An understanding of dialectics is one area of education which no leader or "specialist" in science, art, music, education, military or political life in the Soviet Union would dare neglect. Moreover, he must gain a "correct" understanding.

Engels called dialectics "... the science of the general laws of motion and development of nature, human society and thought."\(^6\) Frequently in Communist literature the laws are reduced to three:

1) The law of the transformation of quantity into quality


2) The law of the unity (and interpenetration) of opposites

3) The law of the negation of the negation

Of the first of these laws, the transformation of quantity into quality, Engels says:

For our purpose, we could express this by saying that in nature, in a manner exactly fixed for each individual case, qualitative changes can only occur by the quantitative addition or subtraction of matter or motion (so-called energy).

All qualitative differences in nature rest on differences of chemical composition or on different quantities or forms of motion (energy) or, as is almost always the case, on both. 7

Engels notes that in the case of oxygen if three atoms are united into a molecule, instead of the usual two, ozone is produced and that the nature of ozone is considerably different from oxygen—particularly its odor. Quantity into Quality! He gives numerous other examples, of a chemical nature, showing how the addition or subtraction of atoms alters the nature of matter. A good illustration of the addition of motion or energy is the application of heat to water until the temperature rises to a critical point and the liquid is suddenly transformed into a gas—a "leap" in the process of change.

About the law of the unity or interpenetration of opposites Engels says:

Dialectics has proved from the results of our experience of nature so far that all polar opposites

Engels, *Dialectics of Nature*, p. 27.
in general are determined by the mutual action of the two opposite poles on one another, that the separation and opposition of these poles exists only within their unity and inter-connection, and conversely, that their inter-connection exists only in their separation and their unity only in their opposition.⁸

A magnet provides a good illustration of this point. Each pole repels the other, yet the two are united in one metal bar. The north pole has no meaning or existence without the south pole. If the magnet is cut in half we have two magnets—each with a north and south pole. Here we have unity and interpenetration of opposites. To look at life dialectically one must see things and ideas in terms of their opposites—"both phases of existence."

Action and reaction in physics
Positive and negative poles in magnetism
Combination and disintegration in chemistry
Cellular division and specialization in biology
Positrons and negatrons in electricity
Left-spinning atoms and right-spinning atoms
Male and female
Landlord and peasants
Bourgeoisie and proletariat
Revolution and counter-revolution
War and peace
Life and death

The mutual opposition and struggle involved in all things causes movement and development to take place. Mao Tse-tung says:

The contradictory aspects in every process excludes each other, struggle with each other, and are opposed to each other. Such aspects of a contradictory nature are contained without exception in the

processes of all things in the world and in human thought. A simple process has only one pair of opposites; a complex process has more than one pair of opposites. Various pairs of opposites in turn become opposed to one another. In this way all things in the objective world and human thought are formed and impelled to move.9

There is more than movement involved, however. There is improvement, also. Throughout much of the Marxist literature one may find a kind of underlying optimism. The movements of history seem to operate in a kind of escalator fashion. The Communists, believed to be riding up, necessarily meet the opposition of a few reactionaries who attempt to walk down the wrong way. A struggle ensues on the stair and, while the Communists are deterred for a time, neither the direction nor final results are essentially modified. All are ultimately deposited on the next higher level. Engels says, "... All successive historical situations are only transitory stages in the endless course of development of human society from the lower to the higher."10 Marx "reflecting" the same process says:

They [the working class] know that in order to work out their own emancipation, and along with it that higher form to which present society is irresistibly tending, by its own economical agencies, they will have to pass through long struggles, through a series of historic processes, transforming circumstances and men.11


Stalin emphasized the same point, saying:

The dialectical method therefore holds that the process of development should be understood not as movement in a circle, not as a simple repetition of what has already occurred, but as an onward and upward movement, as a transition from an old qualitative state to a new qualitative state, as a development from the simple to the complex, from the lower to the higher.  

The struggle between all opposites proceeds in various ways and with varying degrees of intensity but out of the struggle eventually comes movement, development and the forward "leap." In regard to the relative nature of the struggle Mao Tse-tung says:

The basic contradiction in the process of development of things, and the quality of the process determined by this basic contradiction, will not disappear until the process is completed; but the conditions of each stage in the long process of development of things often differ from those of another stage. The reason for this is that, while the nature of the basic contradiction in the development of things and the quality of the process have not changed, yet at the various stages in the long process of development, the basic contradiction assumes an increasingly intensified form. Besides, among the numerous big and small contradictions determined or influenced by the basic contradiction, some become intensified, some are temporarily or partially resolved or mitigated, and some emerge anew; consequently the process reveals itself as consisting of different stages. If people do not pay attention to the stages in the process of development of a thing, they cannot deal properly with its contradictions.

---

12 Stalin, op. cit., p. 9.

Negation of the negation, from the Marxist point of view, is another of the general laws of development in all aspects of nature and society. This law involves the process of becoming and passing away and becoming again. It deals with the stages by which something is transformed into its opposite and then back into its original form on a higher level. Negation of the negation is the means by which the old in its natural process of maturation and decay lays the ground work for the coming of the new and so on in an endless cycle. Engels says:

I must not only negate, but also in turn sublate the negation. I must therefore so construct the first negation that the second remains or becomes possible. . . . Each class of things therefore has its appropriate form of being negated in such a way that it gives rise to a development, and it is just the same with each class of conceptions and ideas.14

The law becomes clearest in his illustration of a grain of barley:

Millions of such grains of barley are milled, boiled and brewed and then consumed. But if such a grain of barley meets with conditions which for it are normal, if it falls on suitable soil, then under the influence of heat and moisture a specific change takes place, it germinates; the grain as such ceases to exist, it is negated, and in its place appears the plant which has arisen from it, the negation of the grain. But what is the normal life-process of this plant? It grows, flowers, is fertilised and finally once more produces grains of barley, and as soon as these have ripened the stalk dies, as in its turn negated. As a result of this negation of the negation we have once again the original grain of barley.

barley, but not as a single unit, but ten, twenty or thirty fold.\textsuperscript{15}

Needless to say both Engels and Marx illustrated the law a number of times in the social and historical fields. A transition from primitive communism to private ownership to higher communism was frequently developed in the following manner. The primitive communism of early peoples became a "fetter on production," but through the improvement of tools, the basis for private ownership of tools and property had been created--"Negation!" In time private ownership of the means of production came into violent contradiction with the social nature of the productive processes. The workers are increased, concentrated, improverished, regimented, coerced, and brutalized. The proletariat learns well from its masters and the ground is prepared for a leap to the old form on a higher level. At this point the original negation (private property) is transformed \textit{rapidly} to a form of state ownership which is in correspondence with the social nature of production evolved during the era of capitalism. The new form of state represents scientific not primitive communism.

It is obvious that the three laws of dialectical materialism are interrelated. There is a struggle of opposites; hence, there is a development or addition of internal tensions until a sudden transformation occurs. Put differently, there is matter in motion, constant change, and

\textsuperscript{15}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 149.
an absence of any universal laws other than the laws of change itself. These three laws form the tripod upon which the telescope of Marxian physical and social science rests. In fact, for Marxists the laws are at one with science—they represent "objective truth." Lenin said: "From this Marxian philosophy, which is cast from a single piece of steel, you cannot eliminate one basic premise, one essential part, without departing from objective truth, without falling a prey to a bourgeois-reactionary falsehood."16

One might suspect that the laws of change in physics or chemistry would be inapplicable or nonexistent in a social world of purposeful beings. On this question Engels says:

In the history of society, on the other hand, the actors are all endowed with consciousness, are men acting with deliberation or passion, working towards definite goals; nothing happens without a conscious purpose, without an intended aim. But this distinction, important as it is for historical investigation, particularly of single epochs and events, cannot alter the fact that the course of history is governed by inner general laws.17

Stalin "clarifies" the meaning of the universal application of these laws by implying that history becomes an exact science. He says:

Further, if the world is knowable and our knowledge of the laws of development of nature is authentic knowledge, having the validity of objective truth, it follows that social life, the development of society, is also knowable, and that the data of

16 Lenin, op. cit., p. 377.
17 Engels, Ludwig Feuerbach, p. 48.
science regarding the laws of development of society are authentic data having the validity of objective truths.

Hence the science of the history of society, despite all the complexity of the phenomena of social life, can become as precise a science as, let us say, biology, and capable of making use of the laws of development of society for practical purposes.

Hence the party of the proletariat should not guide itself in its practical activity by casual motives, but by the laws of development of society, and by practical deductions from these laws.

Hence socialism is converted from a dream of a better future for humanity into a science.18

Applying the law of transforming quantity into quality to the social scene Stalin says:

Further, if the passing of slow quantitative changes into rapid and abrupt qualitative changes is a law of development, then it is clear that revolutions made by oppressed classes are a quite natural and inevitable phenomenon.

Hence the transition from capitalism to socialism and the liberation of the working class from the yoke of capitalism cannot be effected by slow changes, by reforms, but only by a qualitative change of the capitalist system, by revolution.

Hence, in order not to err in policy, one must be a revolutionary, not a reformist.19

The law of the unity and struggle of opposites is also socially applicable. Stalin says:

Further, if development proceeds by way of the disclosure of internal contradictions, by way of collisions between opposite forces on the basis of these

---


contradictions and so as to overcome these con-
tradictions, then it is clear that the class
struggle of the proletariat is a quite natural
and inevitable phenomenon.

Hence we must not cover up the contradictions of
the capitalist system, but disclose and unravel
them; we must not try to check the class struggle
but carry it to its conclusion.

Hence, in order not to err in policy, one must pur-
sue an uncompromising proletarian class policy, not
a reformist policy of harmony of the interests of the
proletariat and the bourgeoisie, not a compromisers'
policy of "the growing of capitalism into socialism." 20

Regarding negation of negation Stalin says:

Further, if the world is in a state of constant
movement and development, if the dying away of the
old and the upgrowth of the new is a law of devel-
opment, then it is clear that there can be no
"immutable" social systems . . . no "eternal ideas"
of the subjugation of the peasant to the landlord,
of the worker to the capitalist.

Hence the capitalist system can be replaced by the
socialist system, just as at one time the feudal
system was replaced by the capitalist system.

Hence we must not base our orientation on the strata
of society which are no longer developing, even
though they at present constitute the predominant
force, but on those strata which are developing and
have a future before them, even though they at
present do not constitute the predominant force. 21

The Role of the Intellectual

To Marx and Engels the chief contradictions in society
were economic and class contradictions. Private ownership of
the means of production in contradiction with the social

21Ibid., p. 13.
nature of the relations of production, gave rise to varying forms of class struggle under capitalism. The economic and class contradictions worked themselves out dialectically in a perpetual systole and diastole of history. Man could not influence the course of events save as he might here and there produce some change in the economic base, i.e., an important invention. But even the economic changes proceeded dialectically and man could only hasten or retard the process. Freedom for man lay in "the appreciation of necessity."

Man's mental processes were a "reflection" of the processes of nature, Marx said "... the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind, and translated into forms of thought."22 This statement, along with the whole materialistic philosophy of Marx, implies a correspondence theory of truth. The door, however, is open for mistakes on the part of man. To "translate" reflections into (dialectical) "forms of thought" is a movement involving some real "leaps," and furthermore, the reflections are not always exact. On this point Lenin says:

Materialism in general recognises objectively real being (matter) as independent of the mind, sensation, experience, etc., of humanity. Historical materialism recognises social being as independent of the social consciousness of humanity. In both

cases consciousness in only the reflection of being, at best an approximately true (adequate, ideally exact) reflection of it.\textsuperscript{23}

Out of the possibility of error comes the role of the intellectual, the role of the vanguard class, the role of the vanguard state, and orthodoxy and purges within the vanguard party.

When Marx wrote the \textit{Manifesto} in 1848, little emphasis was placed upon the role of the intellectual. At that time Marx wrote:

Further, as we have already seen, entire sections of the ruling classes are, by the advance of industry, precipitated into the proletariat, or are at least threatened in their conditions of existence. These also supply the proletariat with fresh elements of enlightenment and progress.

Finally, in times when the class-struggle nears the decisive hour, the process of dissolution going on within the ruling class—\textit{in fact}, within the whole range of old society—assumes such a violent, glaring character that a small section of the ruling class cuts itself adrift and joins the revolutionary class, the class that holds the future in its hands. Just as, therefore, at an earlier period, a section of the nobility went over to the bourgeoisie, so now a portion of the bourgeoisie goes over to the proletariat, and in particular, a portion of the bourgeois ideologists, who have raised themselves to the level of comprehending theoretically the historical movements as a whole.\textsuperscript{24}

In the years which followed, the industrial revolution proceeded, political democracy developed in some countries,

\textsuperscript{23}Lenin, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 377.

and the Paris Commune failed in France. In 1872, addressing
the Hague Convention of the First International, Marx said:

> We know that the institutions, the manners and the
> customs of the various countries must be considered,
> and we do not deny that there are countries like
> England and America, and, if I understood your
> arrangements better, I might even add Holland,
> where the worker may attain his object by peaceful
> means.\(^25\)

A whole new possibility was opened before the workers.
Possibly through the democratic ballot Samson would be able
to crack the pillars of the old state. "Revisionist Marxism"
became the style. With an \textit{evolutionary} approach to Marxism
the intellectual class did not need to "cut itself adrift"
from the old society in order to join forces with "the class
that holds the future in its hands." Socialist parties
developed rapidly in many countries during this period and
in 1889 (six years after Marx's death) the Second--or
Socialist--International was formed. With such a democratic
(and respectable) approach to the social scene the ideas of
Marx and Engels gained wider recognition. Lenin, reviewing
the positive and negative parts played by the Second Inter-
national, said:

> The Second International (1889-1914) was the inter-
national organisation of the proletarian movement
> which grew in breadth, and this entailed a tempo-
rary drop in the revolutionary level, a temporary

\(^{25}\)Harry W. Laidler, \textit{A History of Socialist Thought}
increase in the strength of opportunism, which, in the end, led to the disgraceful collapse of this International.²⁶

Had Marx really given up the idea of revolution? If so, he must have altered (or never taken seriously) the idea that all nature and the universe advance or change by a process of leaps. Perhaps he felt the reformist approach was a necessary strategic maneuver for that particular stage (a quantitative change which would ultimately produce a qualitative one). Or he may have "reflected" or "translated" the developing situation incorrectly. Stalin addressed himself to this point, as well as to the question of democratic evolution, as follows:

Marx's qualifying phrase about the Continent gave the opportunists and Mensheviks of all countries a pretext for proclaiming that Marx had thus conceded the possibility of the peaceful evolution of bourgeois democracy into a proletarian democracy, at least in certain countries outside the European continent (England, America). Marx did in fact concede that possibility, and he had good grounds for conceding it in regard to England and America in the seventies of the last century, when monopoly capitalism and imperialism did not yet exist, and when these countries, owing to the special conditions of their development, had as yet no developed militarism and bureaucracy. That was the situation before the appearance of developed imperialism. But later, after a lapse of thirty or forty years, when the situation in these countries had radically changed, when imperialism had developed and had embraced all capitalist countries without exception, when militarism and bureaucracy had appeared in England and America also, when the special conditions

for peaceful development in England and the United States had disappeared—then the qualification in regard to these countries necessarily could no longer hold good.27

Could the working men of all countries join hands across national borders and usher in the new order by peaceful means? Was the increasingly better living standards of workers in most industrial countries the consequence of political power achieved through the democratic ballot? To these questions Lenin gave a negative answer. In his opinion the Revisionist policy was misleading the proletariat. Were each country to develop socialism in its own way nationalism would be intensified. The alleged better living conditions, he continued, were rooted, in fact, in the imperialistic policies of the bourgeoisie and were given by them (not wrung from them) as a sop to stave off revolution. The real interests of the workers were being betrayed by chauvinism and reformers. Some of Lenin's views were born out when the Second International split up over policy regarding the First World War.

As early as 1904 Lenin was declaring the need of a revolutionary party led by a tightly knit group of theorists who correctly understood Marx's view and would work in the "true" interests of the proletariat. Lenin said:

Without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement. This cannot be insisted upon too strongly at a time when the fashionable

27Joseph Stalin, Problems of Leninism (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1940), p. 34.
preaching of opportunism is combined with absorption in the narrowest forms of practical activity. The importance of theory for Russian Social-Democrats is still greater for three reasons, which are often forgotten:

The first is that our Party is only in the process of formation, its features are but just becoming outlined, and it has not yet completely settled its accounts with other tendencies in revolutionary thought which threaten to divert the movement from the proper path. Indeed, in very recent times we have observed (as Axelrod long ago warned the Economists would happen) a revival of non-Social-Democratic revolutionary tendencies. Under such circumstances, what at first sight appears to be an "unimportant" mistake may give rise to most deplorable consequences, and only the short-sighted would consider factional disputes and strict distinction of shades to be inopportune and superfluous. The fate of Russian Social-Democracy for many, many years to come may be determined by the strengthening of one or the other "shade."

The policy of attacking chauvinists, bourgeoisie reformists, and deviationists has been a continuing Leninist-Stalinist policy since that time. Lenin's fears centered on the reformist groups in the revolutionary movement. He was afraid these groups would grow timid as a crisis approached and might force the whole movement to settle for less than a real proletarian revolution.

When the Czar of Russia was overthrown during the early months of 1917 the various "reform elements" were in a dominant position and attempted to set up a social-democratic and parliamentary form of government under Kerensky. The

pronouncements of the reform government were sweeping but distinctly non-communist. Estates, for example, were to be broken up and redistributed but not on the basis of Communist collective ownership. Then, too, there were indications that the Kerensky government was going to remain in the "capitalist's imperialistic war" (the First World War).

The Communists, a strong minority, took advantage of the prevailing chaos, indecision, and hesitation (indeed, by calculated agitation they helped worsen the conditions) and seized power. Their cry was: "Peace for the soldiers, land for the peasants and bread for the workers." This they declared would come about "at once" and within one day, after their coup d'état on November 7, the Communist government announced that the land was redistributed. Such swift action placed the majority of the rural population firmly behind the new Communist government in the attempted counter-revolution which followed.

When the First World War ended and the Communist government was more firmly entrenched, Lenin, Trotsky and others attempted to spread the revolution to industrial nations. All of Marx's plans had envisioned communism in an industrial society and these revolutionary leaders were sure that an industrial nation had to be included within the

---

29 It is interesting that the collectivist meaning of this redistribution was not explained to the peasants for several years.
revolution or the ultimate aim of the Marxists would not be achieved. David Shub says: "Lenin was convinced that the Soviet regime could not survive unless it provided the spark to ignite the fires of revolution in other parts of Europe."30

To aid in spreading the revolution Lenin sought to correct two "errors" in the tactics of the revolutionary movements in other countries. First, some Marxists of revisionist inclination were attempting, by their participation in the national legislatures to bring about a proletarian state through piecemeal reform. These Marxists would, from Lenin's point of view, fail to push far enough. They would not advocate the smashing of the old state machinery, nor the creation of Soviets and a proletarian dictatorship in its place. Indeed, their "reforms" might actually prevent the revolution. These Marxists Lenin called "right deviationists." He said:

Kautsky now says that he is not opposed to the dictatorship of the proletariat! The French social-chauvinists and "Centrists" put their names to resolutions in favour of the dictatorship of the proletariat!

But not a hair's breadth of confidence do they deserve.

It is not verbal recognition that is needed, but a complete rupture in deeds with the policy of reformism, with prejudices about bourgeois freedom and bourgeois democracy, the genuine pursuit of the policy of revolutionary class struggle.

Attempts are made to recognise the dictatorship of the proletariat in words in order secretly to drag in alongside of it the "will of the majority," "universal suffrage" (this is exactly what Kautsky does), bourgeois parliamentarism, rejection of the complete destruction, blowing up, complete breaking up of the whole of the bourgeois state apparatus. These new evasions, new loopholes of reformism must be feared more than anything else.

The dictatorship of the proletariat would have been impossible had not the majority of the population consisted of proletarians and semi-proletarians. Kautsky and Co. try to falsify this truth by arguing that "the vote of the majority" is required in order that the dictatorship of the proletariat may be recognised as "correct."

Comical pedants! They failed to understand that voting within the limits, the institutions, the customs of bourgeois parliamentarism is part of the bourgeois state apparatus which must be broken and smashed from top to bottom in order to effect the dictatorship of the proletariat, in order to pass from bourgeois democracy to proletarian democracy.

They failed to understand that, generally speaking, it is not voting but civil war that decides all serious questions of politics when history places the dictatorship of the proletariat on the order of the day. 31

A second group of deviationists, those of the "left," also constituted a threat to the spread of the revolution. The members of this group were dedicated, theoretical, revolutionary Marxists. They had observed the "delaying" tactics of the bourgeoisie and had noted the "watered-down reform measures" passed by various national legislatures. In addition, these Marxists had observed (from afar) the revolutionary seizure of power by the Communists in Russia and the immediate disposal of the constituent assembly and

---

substitution of Soviets and a proletarian dictatorship in its place. Parliamentary thimble-rigging became a fetter in the minds of these "Left Marxists." Parliaments were "outmoded" and should be avoided until they could be crushed. Lenin opened his attack on the leftists with a question.

Should we participate in bourgeois parliaments? The German "Left" Communists, very contemptuously, and very frivolously, reply to this question in the negative. Their arguments? In the passage quoted above we read: "... To reject most emphatically ... all reversion to parliamentary forms of struggle, which have become historically and politically obsolete ..."

This is said with absurd pretentiousness, and is obviously incorrect. "Reversion" to parliamentarism! Perhaps a Soviet republic already exists in Germany? It does not look like it!32

And further on Lenin says:

Even if not "millions" and "legions" but a fairly significant minority of industrial workers follow the Catholic priests, and a like number of rural workers follow the landlords and kulaks, it undoubtedly follows that parliamentarism in Germany is not yet politically obsolete, that participation in parliamentary elections and in the struggle in parliament is obligatory for the party of the revolutionary proletariat precisely for the purpose of educating the backward strata of its own class, precisely for the purpose of awakening and enlightening the undeveloped, downtrodden, ignorant peasant masses. As long as you are unable to disperse the bourgeois parliament and every other type of reactionary institution, you must work inside them, precisely because in them there are still workers who are stupefied by the priests and by the dreariness of village life; otherwise you run the risk of becoming mere babblers.33

32 Ibid., p. 97.
33 Ibid., pp. 99-100.
Parliaments were in principle outmoded, however, and Communist Party members who participated in them were warned not to become sentimentally attached to the institution nor to become enamored of it as a means of peaceful transition. Lenin warned that there was always a possibility that this sort of defection might occur. He said:

That is why the Communist Parties and all parties which are affiliated to the Third International . . . must adopt an exceptionally strict attitude toward their parliamentary fractions: the latter must be completely subordinated to the control and guidance of the Central Committees of the Parties; they must consist mainly of revolutionary workers; the speeches of deputies must be subjected to careful analysis in the Party press and at Party meetings from the point of view of Communist consistency; deputies must be commissioned to carry on agitational work among the masses, members of these fractions who betray Second International trends must be expelled, etc.34

The idea of subordinating and controlling "parliamentary fractions" was expanded to include other members of the party during the subsequent history of the movement. In April of 1929 Stalin spoke on the topic of party discipline. He said:

The fourth question is the question of discipline. In Bukharin's theses no mention was made of the necessity of maintaining iron discipline in the Communist Parties. That also was a defect of no little importance. Why? Because in a period when the fight against the right deviation is being intensified, in a period when the slogan of purging the Communist Parties of opportunist elements is being carried into effect, the Right deviationists usually organize themselves into a faction, set up their own factional discipline and disrupt and destroy the discipline of the Party. In order

---

34 Ibid., p. 171.
to protect the Party from the factional sorties of the Right deviationists we must insist on iron discipline in the Party and on the unconditional subordination of Party members to this discipline.35

In 1934 (just a few years before the famous "purge trials" in which many leading Bolsheviks were "liquidated") Stalin organized the Party Control Commission. This organization was to check up on the fulfillment of the decisions of the Central Committee and on the Central Committee members, too. In discussing the Party Control Commission before the 17th Party Congress, Stalin said:

Such an organization can be only a Party Control Commission under the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. (B.), working on the assignments of the Party and of its Central Committee and having local representatives who are independent of the local organizations. It goes without saying that such a responsible organization must have great authority. In order that it may have sufficient authority, and in order that it may be able to take proceedings against any responsible comrade, including members of the Central Committee, who has committed any misdemeanour, the right to elect or dismiss the members of this Commission must be vested only in the supreme organ of the Party, viz., the Party Congress. There can be no doubt that such an organization will be quite capable of ensuring control over the fulfilment of the decisions of the central organs of the Party and of tightening up Party discipline.36

The role of the "intellectual" has undergone considerable transformation in the history of Marxism. Marx, in his early days, seems to have expected some of the intellectuals, in advanced industrial societies, to break with the

35 Stalin, Problems of Leninism, p. 249.

36 Ibid., p. 535.
ruling class and join the inevitable revolution. They were to bring "enlightenment" to the revolution when it broke out. This led many intellectuals, who were influenced by Marxism, to adopt a policy of watchful waiting with regards to the revolution. Lenin, who wanted to hasten the "inevitable," called this a policy of "tailism."

Some of Marx's later utterances and the ideas developed by the revisionists of the Second International gave the intellectual a leading, democratic, gradual, and political role. Lenin, while wholeheartedly endorsing the leading role of the intellectual, denied that "bourgeoisie democracy" amounted to anything and consented to political action only to the extent that it led rapidly away from the idea of "gradualism" and towards revolution.

Under Stalin "Party dogma" reached totalitarian proportions and the role of the "intellectual" became that of promulgating and seeing-to-the-execution-of a body of quasi-sacred principles and plans. The gradual development of a capitalist industrial society might eventually have produced an "inevitable revolution" in various countries but revolutionary intellectuals playing a vanguard role could precipitate it much earlier if they hewed to the revolutionary line of Leninism. In bourgeoisie parliaments, Communist "political factions" were required to follow this line.
Role of the Vanguard State

After successfully seizing power in Russia, the Communists, in line with the basic tenets of Marxism, increased their insistence on adherence to party dogma. The reason, during this period, was a nagging fear of counter-revolution, aided and abetted by foreign intervention. Discussing the nature and need of the proletarian dictatorship during that stage of the world revolution Stalin said:

This thesis must be emphasized all the more strongly and categorically for the reason that we are dealing with the proletarian revolution which has for the time being triumphed only in one country, a country which is surrounded by hostile capitalist countries and whose bourgeoisie cannot fail to receive the support of international capital.37

The Communist fears of counter-revolution and intervention were not unfounded. A civil war did occur in Russia and French, British, Japanese, and American troops, for various reasons, played a part in it after the First World War. During the civil war period the Soviet leaders tried to spread the revolution into other nations. This effort was in part a counter-measure to the foreign intervention and in part stemmed from the belief that an agrarian society such as Russia would be unable to create a modern socialist economy.

The Communists were able to crush their opposition at home and the foreign troops also withdrew but the revolution did not spread. Conditions in the capitalist world had become

37 Ibid., p. 126.
"stable" for a time. This fact forced the Communists into a strategic dilemma. They could spend their energy in renewed efforts to spread the revolution into industrial areas and perhaps fail or they could attempt to convert agrarian Russia into a socialist industrial society and perhaps fail in that effort. Before this strategic crisis had been resolved, Lenin died. Trotsky seized one horn of the dilemma and Stalin the other in their struggle for power. Stalin advocated the building of socialism in one country and this gradually became the party-line. Trotsky was branded a deviationist and traitor to the true course of the revolution.

With the revolution over, the "counter-revolution" crushed, and strategic disputes disposed of, the Communists might have been expected to enter a more constructive and permissive era. But they did not. Stalin explained the need for a continuation of dictatorial methods "during the period of socialist construction."

The dictatorship of the proletariat has its periods, its special forms, diverse methods of work. During the period of civil war, the violent side of the dictatorship is most conspicuous. But it by no means follows from this that no constructive work is carried on during the period of civil war. Without constructive work it is impossible to wage civil war. During the period of Socialist construction, on the other hand, the peaceful, organizational and cultural work of the dictatorship, revolutionary law, etc., are most conspicuous. But here, again, it by no means follows that the violent side of the dictatorship has fallen away, or can fall away, in the period of construction. The
organs of suppression, the army and other organizations, are as necessary now, in the period of construction, as they were during the period of civil war. Without these organs, constructive work by the dictatorship with any degree of security would be impossible. It should not be forgotten that for the time being the revolution has been victorious in only one country. It should not be forgotten that as long as the capitalist encirclement exists the danger of intervention, with all the consequences resulting from this danger, will exist.\(^\text{38}\)

By 1932 the first five-year plan was complete. Basic industries had been built and the economy was structured, by various economic rewards and punishments, in such a way as to force the peasantry to modernize their agricultural practices, thus releasing many people to the industrial jobs planned by the Communists for expanding urban centers. Stalin still feared for the safety of the vanguard state and the purity of the Party. He said,

\[\ldots\] the last remnants of the dying classes—the manufacturers and their servitors, the merchants and their henchmen, the former nobles and priests, and kulaks and their toadies, the former White officers and police officials, policemen and gendarmes, all sorts of bourgeois intellectuals of the chauvinist persuasion, and all other anti-Soviet elements—have been thrown out of their groove.

Thrown out of their groove, and scattered over the whole face of the U.S.S.R., these "have-beens" have crept into our plants and factories, into our government offices and trading organizations, into our railway and water transport enterprises, and, principally, into the collective farms and state farms. They have crept into these places and concealed themselves, donning the mask of "workers" and

\(^{38}\text{Ibid.},\ p.\ 131\).
"peasants," and some of them have even managed to make their way into the Party. 39

Stalin's fear of traitors and deviationists in the party led him to "clarify" another basic point of Marxism-Leninism at the Seventeenth Party Congress. Marx and Lenin had spoken of a "withering away of the state" under communism and by 1934 some Party members, though not Stalin, felt a gradual transition toward this goal should be initiated. Stalin said:

It goes without saying that a classless society cannot come of itself, spontaneously [sic], as it were. It has to be achieved and built by the efforts of all the working people, by strengthening the organs of the dictatorship of the proletariat, by intensifying the class struggle, by abolishing classes, by eliminating the remnants of the capitalist classes, and in battles with enemies both internal and external.

The point is clear, one would think.

And yet, who does not know that the promulgation of this clear and elementary thesis of Leninism has given rise to not a little confusion to unhealthy sentiments among a section of Party members? The thesis that we are advancing towards a classless society—which was put forward as a slogan—was interpreted by them to mean a spontaneous process. And they began to reason in this way: if it is classless society, then we can relax the class struggle, we can relax the dictatorship of the proletariat, and get rid of the state altogether, since it is fated to die out soon in any case. They dropped into a state of moon-calf ecstasy, in the expectation that soon there will be no classes, and therefore no class struggle, and therefore no cares and worries, and therefore we can lay down our arms and retire—to sleep and

39 Ibid., pp. 434-435.
to wait for the advent of classless society.
[General laughter.] 40

From 1936 to 1938 the Party engaged in a massive purging of all its "unreliable elements," including many of the oldest revolutionary leaders. In Europe and America people were stunned by the ruthless blood-letting. Even some Communists were shocked. Was this the free society they had fought for? Would this not cause all decent people to turn away from the Communist Party and its leadership? "No!" said Stalin, maintaining that the masses had faith in the Communist Party because it purged itself of opportunists who would betray the proletarian revolution. With every purge, in Stalin's view, the Party endeared itself more to the masses. He gave "proof" of this thesis with the following observation:

In 1937 Tukhachevsky, Yakir, Uborevich and other fiends were sentenced to be shot. After that, the elections to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. were held. In these elections, 98.6 per cent of the total vote was cast for the Soviet power. At the beginning of 1938 Rosengoltz, Rykov, Bukharin and other fiends were sentenced to be shot. After that, the elections to the Supreme Soviets of the Union Republics were held. In these elections 99.4 per cent of the total vote was cast for the Soviet power. Where are the symptoms of "demoralization," we would like to know, and why was this "demoralization" not reflected in the results of the elections? 41

Today the Union of Soviet Socialists Republics is a first rate industrial power, the revolution and

40 Ibid., pp. 517-518.
41 Ibid., p. 646.
counter-revolution have receded forty years or more into history, Stalin is dead, and a new leadership speaks. Is there now a greater chance for liberty of expression? Perhaps. It is interesting to note, however, the response given recently by a Russian academician to a visiting scientist.

J. O'M. Bookris states in the "Reporter,"

> When I asked a Russian colleague if he did not regret the absence of the freedom of western life, he replied in substance: "Freedom for what? If the people had freedom of choice, they would choose wrongly. They would want more consumer goods, to start with, and our economists have shown that we cannot afford to give these until we have obtained some more important long-range goals."^42

If this report is an accurate representation of thinking among Russian intellectuals, the orthodoxy demanded by Stalin during the "building phase" of socialism seems to continue.

The real danger of persistent orthodoxy in the "vanguard state" to world freedom (educational and otherwise) lies in the declared international character of the revolution. In 1920, at the Second Congress of the Communist International, Lenin in discussing the international situation and the task of Communist Party members associated with the International, said:

> The proposition that the exploited must rise against the exploiters and set up their Soviets is not a very complicated one. After our experience, after two and a half years of existence of the Soviet Republic in Russia, after the First Congress of the Third

---

International, it is becoming intelligible to hundreds of millions of exploited people all over the world; and if we in Russia are sometimes obliged to compromise, to play for time, for we are weaker than the international imperialists, we know that we are the defenders of the interests of masses numbering a billion and a quarter. For the time being we are hampered by obstacles, prejudices and ignorance which are passing away hour by hour; but more and more we are representing, and are really defending, this seventy per cent of the population of the world, this mass of toilers and exploited. We can proudly say: At the First Congress we were really only propagandists, we only sowed among the proletariat of the whole world the main idea, we only issued the call for the struggle, we only asked—where are the people who are capable of taking this path? Now, however, we have an advanced proletariat everywhere. Everywhere we have a proletarian army, although sometimes badly organised, needing reorganisation; and if our international comrades now help us to organise a united army, no shortcomings will hinder us in the pursuit of our cause. And this cause is the world proletarian revolution—the cause of creating a worldwide Soviet Republic.43

In 1924 Stalin, with customary dialectic reasoning in regard to the "stages" of the revolution, gave the following staccato analysis of the world scene and the tasks of the proletarian state and associates of the Communist International.

Third stage. Commenced after the October Revolution. Objective: to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country, using it as a base for the overthrow of imperialism in all countries. The revolution is spreading beyond the confines of one country; the period of world revolution has commenced. The main forces of the revolution: the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country, the revolutionary movement of the proletariat in one country, the revolutionary movement of the proletariat in all countries. Main reserves: the semi-proletarian and small-peasant masses in the developed countries, the liberation movement in the colonies and dependent countries. Direction of the

main blow: isolation of the petty-bourgeois democrats, isolation of the parties of the Second International, which constitute the main support of the policy of compromise with imperialism. Plan for the disposition of forces: alliance of the proletarian revolution with the liberation movement in the colonies and the dependent countries.\(^{44}\)

It has often been maintained by Communists outside of Russia that theirs is an indigenous movement uninfluenced and uncontrolled by Moscow. This allegation may be true with regard to the Communist Parties in some countries and it is probably true of individual Communists in all countries but, if so, Lenin did not intend it to be so. He said, for instance, of the problem of a leftist deviation movement among the British communists:

Comrade Ramsay says: "Permit us British Communists to decide this question ourselves." What would the International be if every little faction came and said: Some of us are in favour of one thing and some of us are opposed; let us decide the question ourselves? What would be the use, then, of having an International, a congress and all this discussion? . . . It is quite true that a large section of the best revolutionaries are opposed to affiliation to the Labour Party because they are opposed to parliamentarism as a means of struggle. That is why it would be better to transfer this question to the commission where, in any case, it should be discussed and decided at this very congress of the Third International. We cannot agree that it concerns only the English Communists. We must say in general which are the right tactics to pursue. . . .\(^{45}\)

Discussing the problem of Communist affiliation with the Labor Party further, Lenin concluded that such an arrangement would

\(^{44}\)Stalin, Problems of Leninism, p. 60.

allow them a better chance (at that stage) to be influential with the masses. He then pointed out:

What we get here is collaboration between the vanguard of the working class and the backward workers -- the rearguard. This collaboration is so important for the whole movement that we categorically demand that the British Communists should serve as a connecting link between the Party, i.e., the minority of the working class, and all the rest of the workers.  

Lenin was keenly aware that even a revolution has its evolutionary "stages" - a period when dialectic quantitative changes bring the whole movement to the threshold of a rapid qualitative transformation. Members of the left deviation failed to see the necessity of collaboration during the preparatory stage. Any one, Lenin maintained, could advocate revolution when an older order was in obvious and chaotic disintegration - when revolution was in fact under way - but what should a true revolutionary do when this was not the case? In discussing this problem Lenin set the stage for the development of infiltration and popular front movements in the Western states. He said:

It is much more difficult -- and much more useful -- to be a revolutionary when the conditions for direct, open, really mass and really revolutionary struggle do not yet exist, to be able to defend the interests of the revolution (by propaganda, agitation and organisation) in non-revolutionary bodies and even in downright reactionary bodies, in non-revolutionary circumstances, among the masses who are incapable of immediately appreciating the need for revolutionary methods of action. The main task of contemporary Communism in Western Europe and

America is to acquire the ability to seek, to find, to determine correctly the concrete path or the particular turn of events that will bring the masses right up to the real, decisive, last, great revolutionary struggle.\footnote{Lenin declared, in regard to future strategy, that Communists everywhere should study the numerous tactics employed by the Communist Party in Russia.}

For no other country during these fifteen years had anything even approximating this revolutionary experience, this rapid and varied succession of different forms of the movement--legal and illegal, peaceful and stormy, underground and open, small circles and mass movements, parliamentary and terrorist. In no other country was there concentrated during so short a period of time such a wealth of forms, shades, and methods of struggle involving all classes of modern society. . . \footnote{In distant China Mao Tse-tung learned the lessons well--he said:}

What is called one-sidedness consists of not looking at a problem as a whole. For example, understanding only China but not Japan; understanding only the Communist Party but not the Kuomintang, . . . understanding only revolutionary work underground but not revolutionary work in the open, and so on. In a word, not understanding the characteristics of each aspect of a contradiction. This is called looking at a problem one-sidedly. Or it may be called seeing only the part but not the whole, seeing only the trees but not the woods. As a result of this, it is impossible to find the methods for resolving contradictions; it is impossible to accomplish the tasks of the revolution; it is impossible to do the assigned work well; and it is impossible to develop correctly the ideological struggle in the party.\footnote{Tse-tung, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 24-25.}
The so-called free world is today confronted with a massive accumulation of power within the Communist block. The bases of this power are the planned industrial development of the Soviet Union and its considerable success in linking the Communist revolutionary movement to the nationalist and anti-imperialist revolutionary movements of the "backward" areas of the earth as prescribed by Lenin in his five-point program for the Communist International.50

What may the "Free World" expect from the self-appointed leaders of "the proletarian revolution?" Is there a way of compromise and coexistence? Is the present leadership still as dogmatic as the old? Since revolutionary communism has been achieved only in backward countries during the chaos of international wars does this not indicate that a different and more evolutionary approach to social problems is required among the industrial nations of the West? It is possible that all of these questions may be answered in a way which meets the hopes of free men everywhere. It is necessary, however, in light of recent "Sputnik diplomacy" and in spite of Stalin's "demotion" to examine a policy statement made by him many years ago. He said:

Of course, in the remote future, if the proletariat is victorious in the most important capitalist countries, and if the present capitalist encirclement is replaced by a Socialist and encirclement, a "peaceful" path of development is quite possible for certain capitalist countries, whose capitalists,
in view of the "unfavourable" international situation, will consider it expedient "voluntarily" to make substantial concessions to the proletariat. But this supposition applies only to a remote and possible future. With regard to the immediate future, there is no ground whatsoever for this supposition.\textsuperscript{51}

If one attempts to estimate the development, direction, and role of the "vanguard state" since 1917, a conservative or even an apologist evaluation must conclude that an expansionist policy has been the result. What are the motivating forces behind this expansion? George S. Counts says:

There are three possible rational interpretations of the facts. According to the first, Marxian doctrines are being employed as a spearhead of Russian nationalism committed to an aggressive role in the world; according to the second, the resources and peoples of the Soviet Union are being used to serve the cause of the spread of communism over the earth; according to the third, the Russian leaders are badly frightened and are attempting to marshal every possible resource for defense against an attack by capitalist powers. Each of these interpretations is profoundly disturbing.\textsuperscript{52}

In point of fact it is most probable that all three of the factors involved in these interpretations have played a part. Considering them in reverse order one need only recall the fears of counter-revolution and intervention expressed by early Russian leaders. Later, the rise of aggressive, anti-communist dictatorships in Germany and Japan did nothing to

\textsuperscript{51}Stalin, Problems of Leninism, p. 35.

\textsuperscript{52}George S. Counts and Nucia P. Lodge (Translators), I Want to Be Like Stalin from Pedagogika by V. P. Yesipin and N. K. Goncharov (New York: The John Day Company, 1947), pp. 24-25.
alleviate Communist fears of attack. Nor did the military aspects of the United States policy of "containment," involving the creation of a North Atlantic Treaty Organization army and a ring of air and missile bases about the Soviet Union.

In regard to the second factor, the attempt to spread revolutionary propaganda and, perhaps, stir up actual revolutions in other countries, there would seem to be ample proof that a world-wide Communist revolution, with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as its fountain-head, was the goal of early (if not the present) Soviet leaders.

Count's first point regarding aggressive Russian nationalism, with Marxist promises and ideology used as a smoke screen for expansion, is supported by Milovan Djilas. He maintains that the second generation communists of Russia do not care about the spread of international communism. Djilas declares that the Communist Party constitutes, in effect, a new ruling and property-owning class, with the members interested only in maintaining their position of privilege. Marx's free, international, communist society and the world proletarian revolution are, according to Djilas, considered meaningless ritual by communists, unless they happen to be useful in advancing their privileges and national interests. He says:

International Communism, which was at one time the task of revolutionaires, eventually transformed itself, as did everything else in Communism, and became the common ground of Communist bureaucracies, fighting one another on nationalistic considerations. Of the former international proletariat, only words and empty dogmas remained. Behind them
stood the naked national and international interests, aspirations, and plans of the various Communist oligarchies, comfortably entrenched.53

An examination of some aspects of education in Russia will be fruitful in understanding the nature of "educational freedom" in a Communist society and in understanding the part each of the interpretations, given by Counts, has played in the expansionist foreign policy.

Education in the Soviet Union

Educational developments in the Soviet Union have naturally been concerned with Marx's "great principle" in this field. In the Communist Manifesto Marx outlined a ten point program for the future society. He favored "Free education for all children in public schools. . . . Combination of education with industrial production."54 The latter theme was examined further in Capital. Marx said:

From the Factory system budded, as Robert Owen has shown us in detail, the germ of the education of the future, an education that will, in the case of every child of a given age, combine productive labour with instruction and gymnastics, not only as one of the methods of adding to the efficiency of the production, but as the only method of producing fully developed human beings.55

---

54 Eastman, op. cit., p. 343.
And further,

... there can be no doubt that when the working class comes into power, as inevitably it must, technical instruction, both theoretical and practical, will take its proper place in the working-class schools.56

What this unity of theory with practice meant in terms of institutional arrangements was not developed by Marx. The proper forms for giving life to "Marx's great principle" has been the subject of much controversy within educational circles in the Soviet Union and various schools of thought developed. The advocates of each plan, however, have tried to represent their position as the true expression of "Polytechnical Education." One group, cognizant of the demands of developing industry, demanded factory schools where children would be engaged in socially useful production. A second group seems to have envisioned a theoretical emphasis in schools, coordinated with direct participation in production at factories and farms. Still another group favored a linking of mathematical, chemical, physical science, biological, and social theory with practice in "school owned" laboratories and shops.

During the course of educational development in the Soviet Union each of the plans of action may be said to have had its "day in court," although some compromises have been made. In 1946 the Educational Method Council seems to have

56 Ibid., p. 534.
given considerable support to the ideas of the second group.

Maurice J. Shore says:

The second suggestion, direct participation in production, the Council thought, was not only pedagogically feasible but also economical for the State. In connection with this, some educators suggested a compromise: the establishment of special educational shops or departments at real factories, railways, and the like.57

At the Nineteenth Congress of the Communist Party an action was taken which perhaps indicates another shift in policy regarding the institutionalizing of polytechnical education.

George Counts says:

It is expected that every school will be equipped with shops, practical laboratories, and garden plots. Systematic visitation to productive enterprises will be an integral part of the curriculum. There is no suggestion, however, that the level of academic scholarship will be lowered.58

What course polytechnism will take in future Soviet education remains to be seen but some form of it will undoubtedly continue as educators struggle with the existing conditions in an effort to unite their theory and practice effectively.

Another Marxian theory of particular importance concerns the "class character" of education. In answering some of the critics of his educational ideas Marx exclaimed in the Communist Manifesto,

And your education! Is not that also social, and determined by the social conditions under which


you educate; by the intervention, direct or indirect, of society by means of schools, etc.? The Communists have not invented the intervention of society in education; they do but seek to alter the character of that intervention, and to rescue education from the influence of the ruling class.  

The intervention of the ruling class was believed to permeate the entire field of education—into aims, content, teaching methods, and testing procedures. A Marxist educator, E. M. Medynski, in a resume on tests and measurements in Czarist Russia said:

Intelligence tests and achievement tests were made with such calculation, that the children of the indigent parents should appear as weakly endowed and non-achieving. Those tests claiming "objective proofs" were in reality the means to enable the children of the bourgeois to continue their education . . . and to exempt the children of the toilers.  

A class may indeed have intervened in the name of society under capitalism but it was not the aim of Communists to put an end to the process under a proletarian dictatorship. The aim, as Marx indicated, was to alter the "character" of the intervention. In a conversation with H. G. Wells, Stalin said "education is a weapon, the effect of which depends on as to who [sic] controls this weapon, and at whom, it is intended, it should strike."  

---

60 Shore, op. cit., p. 179.
Communist educational intervention has created a monolithic, totalitarian education. Thus the Communist professional elite in art, science, or teaching has one thing in common— a "liberal education," in dialectical materialism. Stalin said:

The training and moulding of our young cadres usually proceeds in some particular branch of science or technology, along the line of specialization. This is necessary and desirable. There is no reason why a man who specializes in medicine should at the same time specialize in physics or botany, or vice versa. But there is one branch of science which Bolsheviks in all branches of science are in duty bound to know, and that is the Marxist-Leninist science of society, of the laws of social development, of the laws of development of the proletarian revolution, of the laws of development of Socialist construction, and of the victory of Communism. For a man who calls himself a Leninist cannot be considered a real Leninist if he shuts himself up in his speciality, in mathematics, botany or chemistry, let us say, and sees nothing beyond that speciality. A Leninist cannot be just a specialist in his favourite science; he must also be a political and social worker, keenly interested in the destinies of his country, acquainted with the laws of social development, capable of applying these laws, and striving to be an active participant in the political guidance of the country.63

Needless to say the teacher has come to have an important role in "political guidance" and in all other aspects of the pupil's education. A Russian text on pedagogy translated by George S. Counts and Nucia P. Lodge states:

Consistency must be observed by all adults who share in the rearing of the young. The several teachers of a given child should not contradict each other, but rather should follow a single line.

As his teachers change, provision should be made for an orderly and consistent sequence of influences. When a child passes with age from certain teachers to others, he suffers injury if he encounters an entirely different treatment, if, for example, mildness changes sharply to severity, or if firmness changes to weakening softness. It is injurious also if the child experiences a duality or even a trinity of education influences, if, for example, the elders in the family say one thing to him and the teacher tells him something else, if one teacher follows one line and his comrade in work another.

Observation of consistency, sequence, and singleness of line in the influence affecting pupils is one of the most important conditions of success in educational work.63

It is difficult to see how original or creative thinking, especially in any of the disciplines connected with ideological questions, may be evoked under such a monolithic educational mural. The emphasis on "singleness of line," coupled with the totalitarian control over curriculum, leaves little chance that thoughtful reflection about alternative views on the part of the student will occur. The role of the teacher is further defined in a section on the cultivation of discipline.

In the third place, discipline is firm, that is, it is unquestioned obedience and submission to the leader, the teacher, or the organizer. Without this there is no discipline; submission to the will of the leader is a necessary and essential mark of discipline.64

63 Counts and Lodge, I Want to Be Like Stalin, p. 49.
64 Ibid., p. 95.
It is one thing to define the nature of the curriculum and the role of the teacher (in the detail and terms just cited) but quite another to get teachers to accept such prescriptions. In the early years of the revolution there were few of the "old intelligentsia" who could be trusted and the party, unable to staff the schools with competent comrades, embarked on a program of winning or "neutralizing" the old "elements" until they could be replaced. Naturally, "incorrigibles" with old "class" ties were eliminated. On this point, Stalin said of the coercive measures used against teachers and other technical intelligentsia:

To begin with, there is the fact that we have routed and are successfully overcoming the capitalist elements in town and country. Of course, this cannot evoke joy among the old intelligentsia. Very probably they still express sympathy for their defeated friends. But sympathizers, still less those who are neutral or who vacillate, are not in the habit of voluntarily agreeing to share the fate of their more active friends when the latter have suffered severe and irreparable defeat.65

Another coercive measure used by the Communists was a system of student spies organized in student government bodies and under the control of the League of Young Communists. George Counts presents the following from an officially approved pedagogy edited by I. A. Kairov:

One should note the large positive role which children's self-government played in the school during the first years of the revolution in the struggle with the old reactionary traditions of

65Stalin, Problems of Leninism, p. 381.
the school, with its inflexible habits and the conservative temper of a certain part of the body of teachers. Revolutionary youth, standing on the side of Soviet power, played a large role in demolishing the old and creating the new Soviet school.

To this Counts adds.

Indeed, a "flying brigade" of Young Communists might enter a classroom or lecture hall at any time for the purpose of finding out whether the teacher or instructor was propagating the "truth"—the truth of the toiling masses of the world.66

Although various forms of the "stick" were employed to neutralize opposition from teachers the "carrot" was also used. Salaries were raised and numerous "progressive experiments" were allowed. The latter were permitted partly because the Communists did not know exactly what they wanted to do in this area and partly to transform teacher opposition into allegiance. Later on, when the Communists were more firmly entrenched, any opponents who still remained, were replaced with a "new intelligentsia" of loyal Communists. In dealing with educational matters the Communists had been confronted with the difficulty of creating a Communist educational system without Communists. Counts says:

In confronting the dilemma, the Bolsheviks followed two courses—a short-term course and a long-term course. The one took the form of a many-sided effort to persuade, cajole, coerce, and capture the "bourgeois intelligentsia"; the other took the form of a positive and an equally manysided effort to create a new intelligentsia "flesh of the flesh and blood of the blood of the proletariat."67


67Ibid., pp. 142-143.
Most teachers in the Soviet Union today are Party members or are Communist oriented. Either type, however, may stray into deviation or become lax with regard to important matters and this is even more true of the few "non-political" specialists who for one reason or another, are still allowed to teach or do research. To take care of such problems in the ten-year school a code of "Rules of Internal Order" was established in 1946 and a line-of-command set up to ensure the correct functioning of the rules. Counts says:

Ultimate responsibility for the conduct of the ten-year school, like everything else in the Soviet Union, rests on the Central Committee of the Party. At the same time, the Central Committee achieves its purposes through the organs of the Soviet government from the Supreme Soviet down to local soviets. In the case of the middle school the Ministry of Education in each of the Union Republics is administratively responsible through the school director whom it appoints. And he, according to the "Rules of Internal Order," is "immediately responsible for the entire work of the school." In the words of the official textbook, "the administration of the school must be built on the foundation of one-man management and full personal responsibility by the director for the entire institution, for the work as a whole and for its several parts." The director in turn "exacts personal responsibility of each separate worker for the business entrusted to him." He must check the "execution of assignments--the execution of all the directives of the state, the execution of the orders of immediate superiors for a given task, the execution by each worker of the plans of his work and duties." He must "check the work of each teacher, visiting classes, becoming acquainted with the record and the condition of knowledge of the pupils." In case of deficiencies, he "must undertake immediately measures for their correction." Obviously the middle school is thoroughly organized and administered to serve the directives of the Party.68

68 Ibid., p. 79.
To further ensure a "correct" dialectical materialist point of view in the various subject matter disciplines, a "stable text" is provided and constitutes the "daily fare" of the student in the various courses. In describing the stable text Counts says:

Briefly, it is a textbook prepared according to Party directives and is the only textbook for the subject and grade. Consequently, the pupil is neither confused nor enlightened by having to confront opposing or even differing points of view. In his early years he is taught the "truth," the "truth of the toiling masses of the world," as revealed, altered, and reversed by the decrees of the Central Committee. And these changes in content are to be understood, not as responses to the advancement of historical knowledge, but rather as responses to the demands of domestic and foreign policy as formulated by the Party.69

The teacher, at the lower end of the line-of-command, is to check on the students mastery of "knowledge." A Russian text on pedagogy states,

The teacher first of all must make exactions of the pupils during the recitation. He does not coax pupils; he demands obedience. Strictness signifies a definite system of work. The teacher not only sets forth the materials of instruction, but also checks to see that the materials are assimilated and that both class and home assignments are carried out. Likewise he tests to discover how fully the materials are mastered and how carefully and accurately notes are kept. Demands upon pupils must be firm, clear, and definite; their fulfillment must be systematically controlled and checked.70

No teacher, in making "exactions" of the student, is allowed to resort to corporal punishment or psychologically

69Ibid., p. 96.
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damaging punishments such as a table of dishonor. A student may be reproved, dismissed from class, detained after school, reprimanded, given a low grade in conduct or (in extreme cases) expelled. The conditions calling for the various forms of punishment are defined and while the punishments may be administered either in public or private they cannot be degrading.\textsuperscript{71}

If these limits on the teacher's power seem to weaken the authoritarian practices of Communists it must be remembered that the monolithic nature of the curriculum and effective Party control over all other aspects of cultural life in the Soviet Union probably offsets the "loss." Newspapers, radios, movies, television, book publishing, reviews, posters, music, art, and even science, are controlled or regulated by the Party. Effective control over the school system is insufficient for the totalitarian Communist—he must control all of the "cultural apparatus" for he too, knows that "education goes on whether school keeps or not."

Not even play activities or home life escape the Party's concern that "proper" moral ideas and habits are being built.

And for this purpose it is necessary for the teacher to know to what influences the child is subjected in the family, how those around him of his own and older age have influenced and are influencing him, what his interests are, how he behaves in a collective, what good and bad habits he has formed, what

\textsuperscript{71} Ibid., pp. 115-117.
deficiencies of character he has which must be rooted out, and so on. Without concrete knowledge of each individual child a planned and purposeful influence cannot be achieved.72

All "bad habits" (as defined by the current Party-line) are to be "rooted-out" and new ones are to be stamped in with efficiency and simplicity. The following illustration of the process, occurs in I Want to Be Like Stalin:

Let us suppose that a child is habituated to rising at nine o'clock in the morning. But when the school year begins he is obliged to rise earlier. Naturally, since tardiness is not permitted, a new habit must be established and established quickly.

The formation of a new habit begins in the pupil with an awareness of its essence and significance. And then, thanks to numerous repetitions of the action, it becomes ever stronger, finally becoming habitual. Thereafter it is performed automatically whenever the conditions appear which call for the application of the given rule of conduct.73

The purpose of this comprehensive effort to control education (both formal and informal) is to make Marxism the way of life with every individual in the Soviet Union. Corporal punishment of wayward individuals seems unnecessary because there appear to be no avenues of advancement or opportunity, except those controlled by the Party. The only road open is to confess one's error and get on with the business of becoming a "new man." For those who "prove themselves" the opportunity of further education is held out by a system

---
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of state scholarships. The Third Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics states:

Citizens of the U.S.S.R. have the right to education. This right is ensured by universal compulsory elementary education; by the fact that education, including higher (university) education is free of charge; by the system of state scholarships for the overwhelming majority of students in the higher schools; by instruction in schools being conducted in the native language and by the organization of free vocational, technical and agronomic training for the toilers in the factories, state farms, machine and tractor stations and collective farms.\(^7\)

In this constitutional statement one may see the polytechnical base of Soviet education as well as a system of rewards (in the higher levels) which are held out to the efficient and the favored.

In trying to understand the particular structure of Soviet education, with its emphasis on polytechnism, ideological orthodoxy, line-of-command administration, and a comprehensive system of rewards and punishments one must bear in mind not only the revolutionary aims of international communism but also the practical problems involved in attempting to transform a largely illiterate peasantry into an effective industrial population. It is towards the achievement of such diverse goals that Soviet education, as Professor Kairov states "... postulates first the understanding of the

\(^7\)Shore, op. cit., p. 198.
fundamentals of science, second, the development of intellectual abilities and aptitudes and third, the formation of a dialectical-materialist outlook."75

The "dialectical-materialist outlook" is, from the party's point of view, intricately involved with the whole movement of communism. This outlook throws light on the "nature of the disintegration going on within the old order" and on the developing "reserves of power" within the Communist bloc and the colonial areas at various stages "of the world revolution."

Dialectical materialism also allows (perhaps through the "unity of opposites") the teaching of orthodoxy and revolution as well as peace and war in one and the same classroom. Party members, after some forty years in power, ought to represent stability and the status quo, yet considerable emphasis on revolutionary struggle and war is found in the educational program.76 The explanation of the "contradiction" is, of course "the international character" of the Communist revolution. If Stalin's slogan had been "socialism in one country," stability and coexistence might have been developed by now. But since the slogan was "socialism in one country first" the revolution is incomplete and the natural and human resources of the vanguard state are, in the minds of


76Counts and Lodge, I Want to Be Like Stalin, p. 42.
the Party elite, to be used in spreading the movement (by armed conflict if necessary). The actions of the Red army with regard to Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary may be explained, in part, as an expansionist attempt to spread the revolution, but fear of intervention and Russian "national interests" (those of the Djilas New Class) may also have been factors (see p. 74).

The increasing "nationalistic tendencies" of the international communist movement do not represent a logical conflict. The patriotic emphasis found in Russian schools is, of course, "Soviet patriotism," though placed in an international setting.

National pride and national self-consciousness are characteristic of Soviet patriotism. These qualities must be cultivated in our children.

Forward-looking men and women of the past who passionately loved their people and their Motherland were never confined within the framework of a narrow nationalism. "Patriotism, living and active," wrote Dobroliubov, "is to be distinguished precisely by the fact that it excludes all international animosity; and an individual inspired by such patriotism is ready to work for all mankind, if only he can be useful. Genuine patriotism as a personal expression of love for mankind cannot be reconciled with hostility toward particular peoples."77

At first blush, then, one might question whether what appears to be a warlike spirit of "Soviet patriotism" is this, in fact. No problem arises here, however, as these words make clear.

Hatred of the enemies of the socialist Motherland by no means contradicts the principle of humanism,

77 Ibid., p. 55.
since it is devoted to the protection of the rights and liberty of the workers from the designs of beasts of prey.\textsuperscript{78}

It may be, as Milovan Djilas, Daniel Shore\textsuperscript{79} and others maintain, that the Marxian tenets of an international proletarian revolution constitute a bothersome ritual to most students but, even if this cause for expansion is abandoned, the fears of encirclement and intervention, along with an increasing awareness of national-self-interest, remain. The latter forces alone are a sufficient cause for aggressive action and there is no reason why Russian diplomats cannot use the promises of communism as an effective screen for more immediate gains.

The expansionist policy of the Soviet Union also entails an intricate program of institutional penetration within the bourgeoisie states. Lenin said:

\begin{quote}
The dictatorship of the proletariat is the most determined and revolutionary form of the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie. Such a struggle may be successful only when the most revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat is backed by the overwhelming majority of the latter. Hence, preparation for the dictatorship of the proletariat \ldots requires that the old leaders be replaced by Communists in proletarian organizations of absolutely all types, not only political, but also industrial, co-operative, educational, etc. \ldots Hence, preparation for the dictatorship of the proletariat must be started everywhere and immediately with the following method among others.

In all organisations without exception--unions and associations, primarily proletarian, and also
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{78}Ibid., p. 72.
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organisations of the non-proletarian, toiling and exploited masses (political, industrial, military, co-operative, educational, sports, etc., etc.), groups or nuclei of Communists should be formed--mainly open groups, but also secret groups, which should be obligatory in every case when their suppression, or the arrest or deportation of their members by the bourgeoisie may be expected--and these nuclei, closely connected with each other and with the Party centre, interchanging their experiences, carrying on work of agitation, propaganda and organisation, adapting themselves to absolutely all spheres of public life, absolutely to all varieties and subdivisions of the toiling masses, must systematically train themselves, and the Party, and the class, and the masses, by means of this diversified work.30

The quotation clearly reveals the "open" and "secret" nature of the program for institutional penetration and leaves little room for doubt concerning Lenin's intent. This program may be pursued in the interests of the revolution, the new class and Russian nationalism, or from fear. In any case, the policy should be a matter of some concern to educators in non-Soviet states, for from the Marxian point of view it is a divisive mechanism to hasten change. In dialectical terms, it is a quantitative addition or subtraction leading to a qualitative transformation or leap.

In the following chapter some important aspects of the Communist movement in the United States will be explored. The stand taken against members of the Communist Party by advocates of the professional competence position will also be examined in greater detail.

CHAPTER III

BEARING OF THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT ON THE PROFESSIONAL
COMPETENCE POLICY OF EXCLUDING COMMUNIST TEACHERS

The Third International, as we have seen, was an organiza­tion created by Lenin to (1) disturb conditions within the
nations whose armies intervened against the Reds during the
counter-revolution and (2) coordinate revolutionary activi­ties throughout the world. Lenin feared that the World
Revolution might stray from "its true course" unless the
movement was coordinated by the Vanguard State and member­ship in all countries was restricted to those who would
adhere to the developing "principles of revolution" and "the
proletarian dictatorship" laid down by the Third International.
In light of this fear, he introduced a resolution proposing
nineteen conditions of party affiliation with the Third
International at the Second Congress of the International in
July of 1920.¹

The nineteen conditions were subsequently rephrased
and extended into twenty-one conditions which were adopted as
prerequisites of Party membership in the International. Since
there is much confusion as to what membership in a party

¹V. I. Lenin, The Communist International, Vol. X,
Selected Works (New York: International Publishers, 1938),
pp. 201-206.
affiliated with the Third International implies a copy of those conditions is included at this point.

1. The general propaganda and agitation should bear a really Communist character, and should correspond to the programme and decisions of the Third International. The entire party press should be edited by reliable Communists who have proved their loyalty to the cause of the Proletarian revolution. The dictatorship of the proletariat should not be spoken of simply as a current hackneyed formula, it should be advocated in such a way that its necessity should be apparent to every rank-and-file working man and woman, to each soldier and peasant, and should emanate from everyday facts systematically recorded by our press day by day.

All periodicals and other publications, as well as party publications and editions, are subject to the control of the presidium of the party, independently of whether the party is legal or illegal. The editors should in no way be given an opportunity to abuse their autonomy and carry on a policy not fully corresponding to the policy of the party.

Wherever the followers of the Third International have access, and whatever means of propaganda are at their disposal, whether the columns of newspapers, popular meetings, labor unions, or cooperatives—it is indispensable for them not only to denounce the bourgeoisie, but also its assistants and agents—reformists of every color and shade.

2. Every organization desiring to join the Communist International shall be bound systematically and regularly to remove from all the responsible posts in the labor movement (Party organizations, editors, labor unions, parliamentary factions, cooperatives, municipalities, etc.), all reformists and followers of the "centre," and to have them replaced by Communists, even at the cost of replacing at the beginning "experienced" men by rank-and-file working men.

3. The class struggle in almost every country of Europe and America is entering the phase of civil war. Under such conditions the Communists can have no confidence in bourgeois laws. They should create everywhere a parallel illegal apparatus, which at the decisive moment should do its duty by the party,
and in every way possible assist the revolution. In every country where in consequence of martial law or of other exceptional laws, the Communists are unable to carry on their work lawfully, a combination of lawful and unlawful work is absolutely necessary.

4. A persistent and systematic propaganda and agitation is necessary in the army, where Communist groups should be formed in every military organization. Wherever, owing to repressive legislation, agitation becomes impossible, it is necessary to carry on such agitation illegally. But refusal to carry on or participate in such work should be considered equal to treason to the revolutionary cause, and incompatible with affiliation with the Third International.

5. A systematic and regular propaganda is necessary in the rural districts. The working class can gain no victory unless it possesses the sympathy and support of at least part of the rural workers and of the poor peasants, and unless other sections of the population are equally utilized. Communist work in the rural districts is acquiring more predominant importance during the present period. It should be carried on through Communist workingmen of both city and country who have connections with the rural districts. To refuse to do this work, or to transfer such work to untrustworthy half reformists, is equal to renouncing the proletarian revolution.

6. Every party desirous of affiliating with the Third International should renounce not only avowed social patriotism, but also the falsehood and the hypocrisy of social pacifism; it should systematically demonstrate to the workers that without a revolutionary overthrow of capitalism no international arbitration, no talk of disarmament, no democratic reorganization of the League of Nations will be capable of saving mankind from new Imperialist wars.

7. Parties desirous of joining the Communist International must recognize the necessity of a complete and absolute rupture with reformism and the policy of the "centrists," and must advocate this rupture amongst the widest circles of the party membership, without which condition a consistent Communist policy is impossible. The Communist International cannot reconcile itself to the fact that such avowed reformists as for instance Turati,
Modigliani, Kautsky, Hillquit, Longuet, Macdonald, and others should be entitled to consider themselves members of the Third International. This would make the Third International resemble the Second International.

8. In the Colonial question and that of the oppressed nationalities there is necessary an especially distinct and clear line of conduct of the parties of countries where the bourgeoisie possesses such colonies or oppresses other nationalities. Every party desirous of belonging to the Third International should be bound to denounce without any reserve all the methods of "its own" imperialists in the colonies, supporting not only in words but practically a movement of liberation in the colonies. It should demand the expulsion of its own Imperialists from such colonies, and cultivate among the workingmen of its own country a truly fraternal attitude towards the working population of the colonies and oppressed nationalities, and carry on a systematic agitation in its own army against every kind of oppression of the colonial population.

9. Every party desirous of belonging to the Communist International should be bound to carry on systematic and persistent Communist work in the labor unions, cooperatives and other labor organizations of the masses. It is necessary to form Communist groups within the organization, which by persistent and lasting work should win over labor unions to Communism. These groups should constantly denounce the treachery of the social patriots and of the fluctuations of the "centre." These Communist groups should be completely subordinated to the party in general.

10. Any party belonging to the Communist International is bound to carry on a stubborn struggle against the Amsterdam "International" of the yellow labor unions. It should propagate insistently amongst the organized workers the necessity of a rupture with the yellow Amsterdam International. It should support by all means in its power the International Unification of Red Labor Unions, adhering to the Communist International, which is now beginning.

11. Parties desirous of joining the Third International shall be bound to inspect the personnel of their parliamentary factions, to remove all unreliable elements therefrom, to control such factions, not only verbally but in reality, to subordinate them to
the Central Committee of the party, and to demand from each proletarian Communist that he devote his entire activity to the interests of real revolutionary propaganda.

12. All parties belonging to the Communist International should be formed on the basis of the principle of democratic centralization. At the present time of acute civil war the Communist Party will be able fully to do its duty only when it is organized in a sufficiently thorough way when it possesses an iron discipline, and when its party centre enjoys the confidence of the members of the party, who are to endow this centre with complete power, authority and ample rights.

13. The Communist parties of those countries where the Communist activity is legal, should make a clearance of their members from time to time, as well as those of the party organizations, in order systematically to free the party from the petty bourgeois elements which penetrate into it.

14. Each party desirous of affiliating with the Communist International should be obliged to render every possible assistance to the Soviet Republics in their struggle against all counter-revolutionary forces. The Communist parties should carry on a precise and definite propaganda to induce the workers to refuse to transport any kind of military equipment intended for fighting against the Soviet Republics, and should also by legal or illegal means carry on a propaganda amongst the troops sent against the workers' republics, etc.

15. All those parties which up to the present moment have stood upon the old social and democratic programmes should, within the shortest time possible, draw up a new Communist programme in conformity with the special conditions of their country, and in accordance with the resolutions of the Communist International. As a rule, the programme of each party belonging to the Communist International should be confirmed by the next congress of the Communist International or its Executive Committee. In the event of the failure of the programme of any party being confirmed by the Executive Committee of the Communist International, the said party shall be entitled to appeal to the Congress of the Communist International.
16. All the resolutions of the congresses of the Communist International, as well as the resolutions of the Executive Committee are binding for all parties joining the Communist International. The Communist International, operating under the conditions of most acute civil warfare, should be centralized in a better manner than the Second International. At the same time, the Communist International and the Executive Committee are naturally bound in every form of their activity to consider the variety of conditions under which the different parties have to work and struggle, and generally binding resolutions should be passed only on such questions upon which such resolutions are possible.

17. In connection with the above, all parties desiring to join the Communist International should alter their name. Each party desirous of joining the Communist International should bear the following name: Communist Party of such and such a country, section of the Third Communist International. The question of renaming of a party is not only a formal one, but is a political question of great importance. The Communist International has declared a decisive war against the entire bourgeois world, and all the yellow Social Democratic parties. It is indispensable that every rank-and-file worker should be able clearly to distinguish between the Communist parties and the old official "Social Democratic" or "Socialist" parties, which have betrayed the cause of the working class.

18. All the leading organs of the press of every party are bound to publish all the most important documents of the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

19. All those parties which have joined the Communist International, as well as those which have expressed a desire to do so, are obliged in as short a space of time as possible, and in no case later than four months after the Second Congress of the Communist International, to convene an Extraordinary Congress in order to discuss these conditions. In addition to this, the Central Committees of these parties should take care to acquaint all the local organizations with the regulations of the Second Congress.
20. All those parties which at the present time are willing to join the Third International, but have so far not changed their tactics in any radical manner, should prior to their joining the Third International, take care that not less than two-thirds of their committee members and of all their central institutions should be composed of comrades who have made an open and definite declaration prior to the convening of the Second Congress, as to their desire that the party should affiliate with the Third International. Exclusions are permitted only with the confirmation of the Executive Committee of the Third International. The executive Committee of the Communist International has the right to make an exception also for the representatives of the "centre" as mentioned in paragraph 7.

21. Those members of the party who reject the conditions and the theses of the Third International, are liable to be excluded from the party. This applies principally to the delegates at the Special Congresses of the Party. 2

History of the Communist Party in the United States

Has the American Communist Party been a member of the Third International? After the Russian revolution a group of left-wing Socialists wanted the Socialist Party of America to affiliate with the Third International. The "Leftists" were expelled from the Socialist Party in May, 1919, and the expelled members formed the Communist Party of America in September of the same year. At the Socialist convention held in August, 1919, another group of leftists were excluded from the Party and this excluded group also formed a Communist Party--The Communist Labor Party, later

known as the United Communist Party. Both the Communist Party of America and the United Communist Party declared their connection with the Third International within the body of their respective constitutions.\(^3\)

In 1921 the Communist Party of America and the United Communist Party (apparently on orders from the Third International) merged into the "Communist Party of America - 1921."

A portion of the constitution of the merged party is quoted here.

**Article I. Name, Purpose, and Emblem**

Section 1. The name of this organization shall be the Communist Party of America, Section of the Communist International.

Section 2. The Communist Party of America is the vanguard of the working class, namely, its most advanced, class conscious, and therefore its most revolutionary part. Its purpose is to educate, direct, and lead the working class of America for the conquest of political power; to destroy the bourgeois state machiner; to establish the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in the form of Soviet power; to abolish the capitalist system and to introduce the Communist Society.

Section 3. The emblem of the Party shall be the crossed hammer and sickle between sheaves of wheat and within a double circle. Below the hammer and sickle the words "All power to the workers." In the circular margin the words "Communist Party of America--Section of the Communist International."

**Article II, Membership**

Section 1. Every person who accepts the principles and the tactics of the Communist Party and of the Communist International, and agrees to submit to the Party discipline and engage actively in its

\(^3\)Ibid., pp. 37 and 47.
work, shall be eligible for membership, provided he is not a member or supporter of any other political organization.\(^4\)

The Party of 1921 was driven underground by the Palmer raids hence the Communist International sent instructions for it to form an open party. The instructions said in part,

It is equally the duty of a Communist Party to defeat by any means that may be necessary the Capitalist Government's attempt to confine the revolutionary party to the underground channels in which it is even more concealed from the masses than it is from the Government. The program of the legal party will have to be somewhat restricted, special measures and slogans which, while not stating the illegal Communist purpose, will objectively have the revolutionary effect upon the masses, must be adopted. The legal party must, at all times, go as far toward the Communist program as is possible while continuing a legal existence.\(^5\)

As a result of these instructions the Workers Party of America was formed. A portion of its constitution reads as follows,

**Article II - Emblem**

Section 1. The emblem of the party shall be the crossed hammer and sickle with a circular margin having at the top, "Workers Party of America," and underneath, "Workers of the World, Unite."

**Article III - Membership**

Section 1. Every person who accepts the principles and tactics of the Workers Party of America and agrees to submit to its discipline and engage actively in its work shall be eligible to membership.

Section 2. Applicants for membership shall sign an application card reading as follows:

"The undersigned declares his adherence to the principles and tactics of the Workers Party of America, and agrees to submit to its discipline and engage actively in its work shall be eligible to membership."

\(^4\)Ibid., p. 62.

\(^5\)Ibid., p. 70.
America as expressed in its program and constitution, and agrees to submit to the discipline of the party and to engage actively in its work."

There was no direct statement of connection with the International in this constitution but in line with the instructions "to go as far toward the Communist program as is possible while continuing a legal existence" the name was later changed to "Workers (Communist) Party of America"—1925.

A portion of its constitution reads,

Article 1. Name of the Party

Section 1. The name of this organization shall be the WORKERS (COMMUNIST) PARTY OF AMERICA, the American section of the Communist International.

Article 2. Emblem

Section 1. The emblem of the Party shall be the crossed hammer and sickle with a circular margin having at the top; "WORKERS (COMMUNIST) PARTY OF AMERICA" and underneath "WORKERS OF THE WORLD UNITE."

Article 3. Membership

Section 1. Every person who accepts the program and statutes of the Communist International and of the WORKERS (Communist) Party, who becomes a member of a basic suborganization of the Party, who is active in this organization, who subordinates himself to all the decisions of the Comintern and of the Party, and regularly pays his membership dues may be a member of the Party.

Section 2. Applicants for membership shall sign an application card reading as follows:

"The undersigned declares his adherence to the program and statutes of the Communist International and of the Workers (Communist Party and agrees to submit to the discipline of the Party and to engage actively in its work."

---

6Ibid., p. 72.
At the time of being accepted as a member of the Party this pledge shall be read to the applicant who shall indicate his endorsement of same.\(^7\)

After the Trotsky purges the Party was reorganized and renamed "Communist Party of the United States of America, Section of The Communist International-1929. The emblem, oath and conditions of membership were essentially the same as the 1925 version.

By 1938 the rise of Fascism caused the International to adopt a more subtle approach in currying international friendship for the Soviet Union. As a consequence the American Communist Party dropped the objectional part of its official title "Section of the Communist International" and became "The Communist Party of the United States of America-1938." In the body of the constitution, however, and on its emblem were the words "affiliated to the Communist International." The oath was also revised to make it less offensive to American patriotism. Another section which follows was included to indicate that the Party was not a revolutionary organization.

Article VI

Rights and Duties of Members

Section 1. The Communist Party of the U.S.A. upholds the democratic achievements of the American people. It opposes with all its power any clique, group, circle, faction, or party which conspires or acts to subvert, undermine, weaken or overthrow any or all institutions of American democracy

\(^7\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 80.}\)
whereby the majority of the American people have obtained power to determine their own destiny in any degree. The Communist Party of the U.S.A., standing unqualifiedly for the right of the majority to direct the destinies of our country, will fight with all its strength against any and every effort, whether it comes from abroad or from within, to impose upon our people the arbitrary will of any selfish minority group or party or clique or conspiracy.  

In 1940 the Voorhis Act became effective. The act required the registration of all political organizations subject to foreign control. The Communist Party constitution was further purified, following passage of the act, by eliminating direct reference to "affiliation with the Third International." The Preamble to the 1940 constitution reads,

The COMMUNIST PARTY of the United States of America is a working class political party carrying forward today the traditions of Jefferson, Paine, Jackson, and Lincoln, and of the Declaration of Independence; it upholds the achievements of democracy, the right of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," and defends the United States Constitution against its reactionary enemies who would destroy democracy and all popular liberties; it is devoted to defense of the immediate interests of workers, farmers, and all toilers against capitalist exploitation, and to preparation of the working class for its historic mission to unite and lead the American people to extend these democratic principles to their necessary and logical conclusions:

By establishing common ownership of the national economy, through a government of the people, by the people, and for the people; the abolition of all exploitation of man by man, nation by nation, and race by race, and thereby the abolition of class divisions in society; that is, by the establishment of socialism, according to the scientific principles enunciated by the greatest teachers of mankind, Marx,

---

8 Ibid., p. 100.
Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, embodied in the Communist International; and the free cooperation of the American people with those of other lands, striving toward a world without oppression and war, a world brotherhood of man.9

This statement might fool the uninformed but those familiar with the "scientific principles" of the great teachers "embodied in the Communist International" will recognize that the working classes "historic mission" is nothing less than its vanguard role in a revolution. No oath of membership was quoted in the 1940 constitution.

During the Second World War the Soviet Union found that the existence of the Third International was a stumbling block in its effort to secure allies and economic and military aid. In May, 1943, the Communist International was buried (or apparently buried) in order that the Soviet Union might survive. A portion of the statement regarding the alleged dissolution reads,

In consideration of the above and taking into account the growth and the political maturity of Communist parties and their leading cadres in separate countries, and also having in view the fact that during the present war some sections have raised the question of the dissolution of the Communist International as the directing centre of the international working-class movement, the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International in the circumstances of the World War, not being able to convene a Congress of the Communist International, puts forward the following proposal for ratification by the sections of the Communist International:

The Communist International, as the directing center of the international working-class movement, is to

9ibid., p. 108.
be dissolved, thus freeing the sections of the Communist International from their obligations arising from the statutes and resolutions of the Congresses of the Communist International.\footnote{Ibid., p. 134.}

It may be noted that this statement does not indicate that there would be no "directing center" for the international movement, only that the Third International would not be that center. Igor Gouzenko, in a statement to the Canadian Royal Commission investigating communism, said,

"The announcement of the dissolution of the Comintern was probably the greatest farce of the Communists in recent years. Only the name was liquidated, with the object of reassuring public opinion in the democratic countries. Actually the Comintern exists and continues its work.\footnote{Ibid., p. 137.}"

The announced dissolution of the Third International did, however, lead to another program for Communists in this country. In 1944 the Communists bent on national unity, and determined to achieve a popular front and victory over Fascism, dissolved the Communist Party and formed the Communist Political Association-1944. This organization, formed at the peak of allied cooperation during the Second World War, had the following preamble to its constitution:

\begin{quote}
The Communist Political Association is a nonparty organization of Americans which, basing itself upon the working class, carries forward the traditions of Washington, Jefferson, Paine, Jackson, and Lincoln, under the changed conditions of modern industrial society.
\end{quote}
It seeks effective application of democratic principles to the solution of the problems of today, as an advanced sector of the democratic majority of the American people.

It upholds the Declaration of Independence, the United States Constitution and its Bill of Rights, and the achievements of American democracy against all the enemies of popular liberties.

It is shaped by the needs of the nation at war, being formed in the midst of the greatest struggle of all history; it recognizes that victory for the free peoples over fascism will open up new and more favorable conditions for progress; it looks to the family of free nations, led by the great coalition of democratic capitalist and socialist states, to inaugurate an era of world peace, expanding production and economic well-being, and the liberation and equality of all peoples regardless of race, creed, or color.

It adheres to the principles of scientific socialism, Marxism, the heritage of the best thought of humanity and of a hundred years' experience of the labor movement, principles which have proved to be indispensable to the national existence and independence of every nation; it looks forward to a future in which, by democratic choice of the American people, our own country will solve the problems arising out of the contradiction between the social character of production and its private ownership, incorporating the lessons of the most fruitful achievements of all mankind in a form and manner consistent with American traditions and character. 12

In addition to the rather moderate preamble there was neither a prescribed emblem nor a prescribed oath, in addition, a disciplinary rule expelling anyone active in any organization which might attempt to "weaken subvert or overturn" American democratic institutions was adopted.

12 Ibid., p. 115.
The Marxist conception of majority rule was prescribed, however, under a section on the "Rights and Duties of Members." This conception involves free discussion leading to a decision by simple majority which is then "binding" on all members. Active support of all resolutions and policies is expected—and continued opposition or inaction after a decision has been made leads to Party examination, discipline, and possible expulsion.

With the end of the Second World War the Soviet Union ended the farce of cooperation with capitalist democracies. At the 1945 convention the "Political Association" was dissolved and the "Communist Party of the United States of America - 1945." was born. This convention, the return to party organization, and the expulsion of Earl Browder all grew out of an article by Jacques Duclos printed in *Cahiers Du Communisme*, the theoretical organ of the French Communist Party. Why American Communists should concern themselves so much over an article criticizing the formation of their 1944 "association" is not known. Perhaps, since the comintern was now "defunct," such articles were "understood" to come from Moscow. A portion of the preamble to the 1945 constitution follows:

The Communist Party of the United States is the political party of the American working class, basing itself upon the principles of scientific socialism, Marxism-Leninism. It champions the immediate and fundamental interests of the workers, farmers, and all who labor by hand and brain against capitalist exploitation and oppression. As the advanced
party of the working class, it stands in the fore­
front of this struggle.

The Communist Party upholds the achievements of
American democracy and defends the United States
Constitution and its Bill of Rights against its re­
actionary enemies who would destroy democracy and
popular liberties. It un­compromisingly fights
against imperialism and colonial oppression, against
racial, national, and religious discrimination,
against Jim Crowism, anti-Semitism, and all forms of
chauvinism. . . .

The Communist Party holds as a basic principle that
there is an identity of interest which serves as a
common bond un­iting the workers of all lands. It
recognizes further that the true national interests
of our country and the cause of peace and progress
require the solidarity of all freedom-loving peoples
and the continued and ever closer cooperation of the
United Nations.

The Communist Party recognizes that the final aboli­
tion of exploitation and oppression, of economic
crises and unemployment, of reaction and war, will be
achieved only by the socialist reorganiza­tion of
society — by the common ownership and operation of
the national economy under a government of the people
led by the working class.

The Communist Party, therefore, educates the working
class, in the course of its day-to-day struggles, for
its historic mission, the establishment of Social­ism.
Socialism, the highest form of democracy, will guar­
antee the full realization of the right to "life,
liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," and will turn
the achievements of labor, science, and culture to
the use and enjoyment of all men and women.13

As can be seen, the international "common bond" of the move­
ment made a subtle reappearance as did the revolu­tionary
"historic mission" and the vanguard role of the working class.

With the advent of the "Truman Doctrine" of "contain­
ment" (1947) and Marshall Plan aid (1947) the Soviet Union

13Ibid., p. 122.
adopted a "new" tactic. The disbanded Comintern was exhumed and given new life and a new name—the Cominform. This was done, as was said in a resolution passed at an international conference of Communist parties, because—

The aggressors of yesterday—the capitalistic magnates of Germany and Japan—are being prepared by the United States for a new role—to become the instrument of the imperialistic policy of the United States in Europe and Asia.

The arsenal of tactical measures utilized by the imperialistic camp has very many forms. Here are combined the direct threat by force, blackmail and extortion, all measures of political and economic pressure, or bribery, of utilization of internal contradictions and controversy for the reinforcement of their positions—and all this which is covered by the liberal-pacifist mask designed for deceit and fooling of people who are not experienced in politics.14

One of the great dangers of the Communist movement, to America and to the American educational system, is the policy of "secret" infiltration suggested in the twenty-one conditions of affiliation. J Edgar Hoover, discussing the industrial aspects of the policy, says:

Never must we forget, however, that even though acts of sabotage are not now part of the Party's program, they may become so in the future. In fact, the communist underground provides a cover to commit sabotage when it will serve the communist cause.

As part of the Party's underground the communists are pursuing a program called colonization, designed to place concealed members in strategic positions in basic industries and defense facilities.15

14 Ibid., p. 139.

Hoover lists several "areas" which are of interest to Soviet espionage in the United States. The first two listed are:

1. Scientific research and development, with particular attention to atomic energy, missiles, radar defense, electronics, and aeronautics.

2. The strength, development, training methods, strategy, and tactics of the armed forces of the United States, together with ordnance, weapons, and military equipment.\(^{16}\)

Educators on campuses engaged in research and various forms of military training should not, from Mr. Hoover's point of view, be unmindful of the potential danger involved in educational "colonization" which might lead to espionage or sabotage.

Mr. Hoover, also sees another danger—recruitment. The secret Communist teacher may, by subtle indoctrination and conferences with his students, come to know which ones might be susceptible to an approach by the Communist Party through its student organizations. Once in the Party and under its discipline, a person can be observed over a period of years until his "orthodoxy" is assured and his services as an espionage agent in the "underground" aspects of Party life can be evaluated. Hoover says:

What were some of the ways through which the Communist Party, USA, rendered aid to Soviet espionage?

Most important, of course was recruitment. The Party was able, time after time, to supply recruits,

\(^{16}\text{Ibid.}, \text{ p. 302.}\)
both members and sympathizers, for espionage use. Suppose the Soviets needed a photographer? a source of information in a Pennsylvania steel plant? a trusted short-wave radio expert? The Party would be expected to, and did, "fill the bill."

This funneling of talent to the Soviets was often accomplished through a special Party contact who was called a "steerer." A trusted oldtime member, he was able to spot recruits for espionage among the Party's ranks and to fulfill requests made by the Soviets. As espionage operations became more complex, the "steerer's" role became ever more vital. The Party was a vast recruiting ground for spy talent.\(^7\)

Lenin, of course, encouraged educational infiltration. To him the prevailing culture of capitalist states was bourgeois in character. This was the "national culture" but within the national framework were "democratic elements" yearning for a democratic education. Maurice J. Shore says:

Lenin heartily approved of those educators in the prevailing social order who were willing to go "into the people" and spread knowledge basic to socialist doctrines, and who thereby drew down upon themselves the thunder of the Russian government. It is they who were the intellectual vanguard of the revolution.\(^8\)

Some instructions presented in *The Communist* (the official organ of the Communist Party) during May, 1937, gave a comprehensive view of the program for educational infiltration:

Party and Y.C.L. (Young Communist League) factions set up within classes and departments must supplement and combat by means of discussions,\(^9\)

\(^{17}\) Ibd., p. 293.

brochures, etc., bourgeois omissions and distortions in the regular curriculum . . . Marxist-Leninist analysis must be injected into every class.

Communist teachers must take advantage of their positions, without exposing themselves, to give their students to the best of their ability workingclass education.

To enable the teachers in the party to do the latter, the party must take careful steps to see that all teacher comrades are given thorough education in the teaching of Marxism-Leninism. Only when teachers have really mastered Marxism-Leninism will they be able skillfully to inject it into their teaching at the least risk of exposure and at the same time conduct struggles around the schools in a truly Bolshevik manner. 19

Professional Competence--an Answer to Educational Conspiracy

During the nineteen thirties members of the Graduate Faculty of the New School for Social Research (many of whom were refugees from the Nazi regime) called attention to the dangers a totalitarian political dogma may present to an educational system dedicated to the free pursuit of knowledge.

Later, the General Faculty of the New School adopted a provision which attempted to make "freemindedness" a part of its professional qualifications,

The New School knows that no man can teach well, nor should he be permitted to teach at all, unless he is prepared "to follow the truth of scholarship wherever it may lead." No inquiry is ever made as to whether a lecturer's private views are conservative, liberal, or radical; orthodox or agnostic; views of the aristocrat or commoner. Jealously safeguarding this precious principle, the New School stoutly affirms that a member of any

political party or group which asserts the right to dictate in matters of science or scientific opinion is not free to teach the truth and thereby is disqualified as a teacher.20

In 1944 V. T. Thayer developed the theme of professional competence in his book, *American Education Under Fire*. He said:

... conduct becoming a teacher cannot rightfully include membership in any group or organization or party dedicated to a policy of undermining the essential structure of our government or our way of life. Or of instilling convictions and beliefs in children or young people toward this end. Or of deliberately organizing materials of learning and classroom experience that subordinate students to the ends of the teacher or to the purposes of an outside group; in short, that fails to see in the student an educational end in himself. ... From this analysis it is relatively simple to define our attitude toward communists and fascists in our schools, or to weigh the appropriateness of teachers becoming members of any organization that subordinates professional performance to its own ends. In each case it is not a belief in communism or fascism as such that tenders membership improper. It is rather the evidence at hand, beyond a reasonable doubt, that communist and fascist party discipline conflicts with and subordinates to its own ends the professional discipline of teaching.21

In 1948-49 the whole question of Communist Party membership and professional competence was brought sharply before the public and the teaching profession when the Board of Regents at the University of Washington dismissed three professors who were connected with the Communist Party. Under the University of Washington Tenure Code faculty members

20Ibid., p. 178.

could be removed for (1) incompetency, (2) neglect of duty, (3) physical or mental incapacity, (4) dishonesty or immorality, and (5) conviction of a felony involving moral turpitude. These grounds for dismissal are subject to various interpretations and only a minority of the faculty investigating committee defined the terms with sufficient liberality to recommend dismissal. President Raymond E. Allen of the University of Washington accepted the minority report.

The main argument advanced by Dr. Allen was that the teaching profession was supposed to seek and teach the truth and that Communist Party membership and belief in communism, made one unfit for this task. He said:

I would point out that the teacher and the scholar have special obligations with respect to the sincerity of their convictions which involve questions of intellectual honesty and integrity. Men in academic life--teachers, scholars, and scientists--are engaged in a vocation which is concerned with the finding of truth and its dissemination, with the pursuit of truth wherever it may lead. Is it possible for an individual, however sincere, to embrace both this unhampered pursuit of truth and, at the same time, the doctrines and dogmas of a political party which admits of no criticism of its fundamental principles and programs? Put in another way, a teacher may be ever so sincere in his belief in Communism, but can he at the same time be a sincere seeker after truth, which is the first obligation and duty of the teacher? My answer to these questions, "He cannot." Therefore, I believe these men, by reason of their admitted membership in the Communist Party described in the above findings, to be incompetent, intellectually dishonest, and derelict in their duty to find and teach the truth.22

---

In response to the argument that membership in a legal political party should not be made grounds for dismissal from the profession Dr. Allen said:

The fact that the Communist Party, U.S.A., has not been declared an illegal conspiracy by the courts is not relevant to the issue of University employment of active members of the Communist Party. A much closer analogy would be that of a judge attempting to conceal a financial interest in a firm that was involved in litigation or receivership in his court. It is not against the law for any American citizen to own stock in a company. It would be occasion for removal from office, however, if it were discovered that a judge had prejudiced his decision by the ownership of stock in a company in such a case. An important function of the University is to teach citizenship. For this teaching to be in the hands of faculty men who secretly belong to an organization advocating the complete overthrow of the American system should be no more tolerated than the unethical and immoral behavior of the judge. 23

President Allen's recommendation to the Board of Regents reads as follows:

I recommend that the Board hold with the minority that respondents . . . are disqualified from membership on the faculty of the University of Washington on the ground that they are members of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and, until these proceedings, kept this fact secret, and therefore are unfit for faculty membership. In these proceedings it has been adequately proved, in my opinion, that they are incompetent, that they are intellectually dishonest, and that they have neglected their duties as members of the faculty. They should be dismissed within the generally accepted meaning of these words as they are listed as causes for dismissal in Section IV of the Administrative Code. 24

The Board adopted the President's recommendations and thus underscored his "liberal" interpretation of the meaning

23 Ibid., p. 91.
24 Ibid., p. 97.
of "incompetency" and of "professional requirements." Within the profession, after the Washington cases, the questions of "free mindedness" and loyalty to the "tools of scholarly inquiry" were brought to the forefront in nearly all discussions dealing with "professional competence."

The Position of Sidney Hook

One of the more insistent, persistent, and consistent advocates of a "Professional Competence" requirement which would exclude Communists from the ranks of the teaching profession has been Sidney Hook. It is for this reason that the essential aspects of his views will be developed at this point. In 1939 Hook declared:

But just as the Bill of Rights has as its basic assumption that those who live by it honestly profess their allegiance, no matter how unpopular it is, so the right to academic freedom has as its controlling assumption that teachers will abide by the ethics and logic of scientific inquiry. This means, at the very least, that they will not take orders or political commissions from conspiratorial groups who seek to impose a party line on the cultural and intellectual life of America. Just as a citizen in a democracy has a right to be protected in his differences, so a member of the republic of arts and sciences has a right to his views, be they correct or incorrect, popular or unpopular. The sole and all-important proviso is that he declare them openly, submit them to the court of critical inquiry, and not cook his conclusions in advance according to some political recipe handed to him by organizations interested not in education but in espionage, political propaganda for foreign powers, and in character assassination of leading American educators who refuse to be bribed, intimidated, or browbeaten into silence.25

---

During the years between the University of Washington controversy and 1953 Professor Hook developed several ideas related to the whole problem and set them down in a book entitled *Heresy, Yes—Conspiracy, No*. One theme which he emphasized was the unfree or captive mind. Hook contends that any deep-seated belief may often lead to action determined by that belief in spite of contrary evidence, professional requirements, or law. He says:

*But with respect to the requirements of action or the implementing of policy, sanctioned after free discussion in a democratic community, a fanatically held idea, even by a man who is not a conspirator, may be considered relevant in addition to his professional qualifications in appraising his fitness for a post.... Let me illustrate what I mean. Suppose a physician fanatically believed that hopelessly ill people should not have their lives prolonged. So long as the community did not approve of the practice of euthanasia, it would not be wise to permit such a man to run a hospital for the aged and infirm. He might, however, be acceptable for some other position.*

Developing his point by reference to the academic profession, Hook said of the teacher who firmly believes in the doctrines of communism:

*The difficulty is compounded by the fact that although he knows he is doing what the ethics of the profession forbids and therefore takes appropriate precautions not to be caught, he is subjectively convinced that his action is justified by his higher loyalty to the Communist cause, and that his very partisanship is closer to the truth than*

---

the objectivity and impartiality of allegedly classless scientific inquiry. What is a little deceit in the interest of the truth—and humanity, too? To a Communist this is a rhetorical question.27

What is at issue, however, is not an individual's deep belief in communism (this might be forgiven) but his membership in an organization which instructs him to follow every twist and turn of its "line."

As we have seen, teaching the young is a public trust—a great public trust. It is not because of his political ideas but because of his membership in an organization which instructs him to violate his trust that the Communist is guilty of conduct unbecoming a teacher. In view of the documentary evidence of the Communist Party instructions on this and similar subjects, any member who professed unawareness of its stand would be guilty of ignorance unbecoming a teacher. Or, it is more likely, he would be resorting to the typical Communist strategy of deceit.28

It is one thing to "instruct" all members to take a certain position or act in a prescribed manner but it is entirely another to force them to do so—especially in this country. How effective is the American Communist Party's discipline over its membership? On this question Hook, at one point, is positive:

Very few individuals who have discussed the issues posed by the existence of the Communist movement have paid proper attention to the existence of the mechanisms of control by which the Communist parties in all countries purge their ranks of the inactive, the doubtful, the half-hearted, or the critical—in short of all whose conformity is less than total. Still fewer have grasped the significance of these

27 Ibid., p. 189.
28 Ibid., p. 188.
controls and the empirical evidence they offer that membership in the Communist Party is something earned only by good behavior as tested by rigorous standards set by a group which is professionally and doctrinally suspicious. If a man has been a member of the Communist Party over a period of time one can bet one's bottom dollar that he has carried out his major instructions and duties of membership to the satisfaction of his Communist superiors. Otherwise he would be outside of the party.

It is or should be now clear that "association" by way of membership in the Communist Party is not innocent or coincidental but is a form of active cooperation and collaboration in carrying out the purposes of a conspiratorial organization. The Communist Party sees to it that all members are instructed about the purposes as soon as they join. Continued membership is possible only in virtue of a series of continued acts of obedience to instructions. Those who dub the active co-operation required of all members of the Communist Party "guilt by association" coyly suggest by that phrase the innocuous association of chance or occasional encounters with Communists in social gatherings. They simply ignore the fact that all members of the Communist Party must "associate" by active co-operation with its purposes or be expelled.29

Elsewhere he states,

Inactivity, unless it is a directed inactivity, reculer pour mieux sauter, as well as disagreement with the decisions of any party organization or committee are grounds for expulsion. Third, the Communist Party weeds its ranks carefully by purge and re-registration and other forms of control. As we have already seen, there exists a Central Control Commission whose task it is to check on all members.30

Hook declares that the nature of the Communist Party's control over its membership allows us the right (with respect

29 Ibid., p. 30.
30 Ibid., p. 183.
to professional qualifications) to "judge them by the company they keep." He admits this is a form of guilt by association but concludes:

American tradition is opposed to the doctrine of legal guilt by association. But common sense has always recognized that there may be moral guilt by continuous association with disreputable persons, as when a city official is condemned because the intimate cronies with whom he "associates" may be gangsters or racketeers. Sometimes a man's fitness for a post of trust is determined by his associations. It all depends upon the specific character of the associations.31

What is the aim or purpose of the teacher-Communist?

It is not, says Hook to advocate heresy. Heretics are proud to proclaim their position—conspirators are not.

The Communist Party teachers are fearful of exposure. They are quite aware that their practices violate accepted notions of academic freedom and responsibility. They are playing outside the rules of the game, prepared, according to the lessons driven home by Lenin, to use deceit and stratagem, outright lies or lying evasions, to achieve their ends.32

The secrecy and anonymity with which teacher-comrades have carried on their work is a clue, in Hook's mind, to the nature of their goals. At one point, he expresses surprise that more are not aware of these aims and proceeds to spell them out.

It is amazing to hear from ritualistic liberals that it is a violation of academic freedom to prevent a man from carrying out the professional misconduct which he has pledged himself to engage

31Ibid., p. 28.

32Ibid., p. 182.
in by virtue of his membership in an organization whose publicly professed aim is to indoctrinate for the Communist Party in classrooms, enroll students in Communist Youth organizations, rewrite textbooks from the Communist point of view, build cells on campuses, capture departments, and inculcate the Communist Party line that in case of war students should turn their arms against their own government.33

At another point Hook turns to the danger of campus espionage.

On the Political Committee of every Communist Party of the world, affiliated with the Kremlin, there is one member who is liaison officer with the Foreign Branch of the Soviet M.V.D. or Secret Police, which interlocks at the top with the Foreign Intelligence Service of the Red Army. All members of the Communist Party are screened by him for their potential serviceability in the extremely ramified espionage nets which the Communist movement has woven throughout the country. All members of the Communist Party in science departments or on science projects are sooner or later requested to report on new work, particularly on inventions and discoveries, to a party functionary or special agent who transmits it to the national liaison officer of the M.V.D. or someone else delegated by him. An elaborate system has been devised to funnel this information to the Kremlin. The roles of Drs. Allen Nunn May, Klaus Fuchs, Clarence Hiskey, Raymond Boyer and others in the Soviet Canadian espionage ring and the U. S. Soviet espionage ring have been incontestably documented. Since in actuality no hard and fast lines exist between secret and non-secret scientific information, it is difficult to see how members of the Communist Party can be safely entrusted with the run of American laboratories.34

When a political movement has such aims, and demands and gets such allegiance from its members, Hook feels the profession is confronted with a danger unprecedented in the

33Ibid., pp. 34-35.

34Ibid., pp. 205-206.
history of education. Breaches of teaching etiquette in the past had been considered matters of an individual's particular acts of transgression—guilt (as in law) had been personal, not categorical.

Hook's position not only runs counter to a rather ill-defined liberal fear of "guilt by association" but, also, it runs counter to the liberal's conception of "clear and present danger." To exclude, in peacetime, according to the liberal, any group from the ivy-covered centers of learning, seems unintelligent. Where is the clear and present danger of a classroom? To eliminate persons before any overt act of professional wrongdoing occurs makes guilt non-personal and introduces what many people feel to be the "fuzzy principle" of "bad tendency exclusion." Who can tell to what limits such a principle may be extended?

Hook frequently maintains that the "personal act" of Communist Party membership is professionally culpable but, despite this "hedge," he does not shrink from advocating the "bad tendency" principle. Hook said, of the liberal democratic society:

It cannot wait for a major piece of sabotage or leak of information in order to act. Yet this is precisely the procedure advocated by those who urge that once an individual has been appointed and served a probationary period, he should be dismissed only if he is caught engaging in espionage or sabotage. Presumably, even if it had been known that Hiss, Fuchs, Boyer, et al. were members of the Communist Party, once employed they should not
have been dismissed until they had carried out their objectives or were on the verge of doing so.\textsuperscript{35}

Elsewhere he elaborated this point as follows:

To punish acts of disloyalty \textit{after they have been committed}, instead of trying to prevent disloyalty, among those who have clearly expressed their intent by membership in the Communist Party, is like saying that instead of trying to prevent a man with the \textit{intent} of committing arson from carrying out his plans, we wait until he has burned the house down and then punish him.\textsuperscript{36}

\textbf{Criticisms of the Classical Position}

Hook's basic criticism of adherents to the classical position in the matter of academic freedom is that they are the champions of unfettered and absolute rights—the absolute right to teach what one believes, even in the face of the contrary evidence, and the absolute right of silence when one is asked about his political commitments.

Literally construed, however, and made absolute, the conception of natural rights is indistinguishable from a might makes right doctrine, a belief in \textit{Faustrecht}, the law of the fist. Without reference to the consequences of our action upon others, invocation of absolute rights is an exultant war cry. The man who exercises his rights to shout falsely, "Fire!" in a crowded theatre is morally guilty of the murder of those trampled to death in the ensuing panic, even if he escapes legal punishment. The man who exercises his right of silence when he observes an actual fire, and sneaks away without reporting it to anyone, is guilty of the murder of those burned to death who would have escaped had they been warned in time—even if his action is beyond the reach of government and law. . . . The democratic community, even if it does not recognize

\textsuperscript{35}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 32-33.

\textsuperscript{36}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 78.
any right as absolute, gives to these strategic rights an enormous presumption of validity, an intrinsic justification conveyed by terms like "sacred" and "revered." They may be abridged only in the gravest emergencies and then only reluctantly and temporarily.37

Many of his "ritualistic liberal" opponents, Hook maintains, seem oblivious to the dangers of Communist infiltration and in championing their conceptions of absolute liberty are "in effect" calling for the abandonment of congressional investigations and the security program. He has been especially critical of a Public Affairs Pamphlet (No.179) entitled, "Loyalty in a Democracy" which was edited by Maxwell Stewart. In discussing the criticisms directed against the present loyalty and security program Hook says,

Some of its procedures undoubtedly are in need of improvement but the report of the Public Affairs Committee instead of making specific recommendations to improve the program in effect calls for its abandonment. This is the position taken in Alan Barth's The Loyalty of Free Men—one so extreme that even the rather doctrinaire Dr. Chafee gags on it. The Public Affairs Committee follows Mr. Barth in suggesting that: "Possibly it would be better if we would honestly admit that we cannot without grave injustice determine in advance with exactness who is likely to commit acts of espionage and sabotage, and leave the problem, as we have in the past, to be dealt with by legislation prescribing punishment for acts of disloyalty after they had been committed."

The word "possibly" is used to soften the shock of this passage: it should read "actually," for a glance at the three recommendations the Committee makes in effect involves the abandonment, as advocated by Mr. Barth, of the entire security and loyalty program. To leave matters "as we have in the past"

is to betray a complete indifference to what happened in the past. The revelations of the Hiss case, to mention only the activities of one Communist ring in government, seem completely lost upon the Committee. Because we cannot say "with exactness" who is likely to commit acts of espionage and sabotage in all cases, it does not follow that we cannot say with great probability who is likely to commit acts of such a character in some cases. In how many life situations can we say with exactness what will happen? Do we therefore do nothing on the basis of good evidence to forestall dire eventualities? Not everybody exposed to a deadly plague will come down with it or transmit it but there is a sufficient likelihood to justify isolating him. There are some people, it is true, who come down with the plague who have never been suspected of being exposed to it. Where anyone to argue that therefore we should not isolate those who unquestionably have been exposed to it, he would convict himself of absurdity.38

That all ideas should be taught by advocates of the ideas, as the "classicist's" position suggests draws Mr. Hook's fire. In considering the arguments advanced by Arthur Garfield Hays he says:

As reported in the New York Times of June 21, 1949, Mr. Hays maintains that "if communism is to be taught, Communists should teach it." The odd thing about Mr. Hays' position is that he has never maintained that fascism should be taught by Fascists, the theory of racialism studied under Nazi or anti-Semitic teachers, or that the theory of plural marriages, religious or secular, should be investigated under the educational leadership of polygamists. It is not difficult for a person who is not a member of the Communist Party to give an adequate and intellectually fair presentation of Communist theory using official Communist sources; for example, Mr. Hays himself. And that Communist theory should be a required study in all colleges is the contention of some of the staunchest proponents of the measure to bar members of the Communist Party from the teaching profession.

38Hook, Heresy, Yes--Conspiracy, No, p. 77. (Hook's Italics.)
The notion that only members of the Communist Party are in a position to understand and expound Communist theory accurately is an obscurantist claim more in keeping with the pretensions of a mystical theology than with an avowedly scientific theory of nature, man and society. Why should membership per se bestow illumination? One can understand why the Communists would make such a claim, as absurd as it is, because the dogmas of orthodoxy are political weapons in factional struggles. Why should someone who is not a Communist make it? A practical difficulty in Mr. Hays' personal is that either we should have to dismiss our Party-line Communist whenever he is purged, and hire one to profess the newer orthodoxy, or we would end up with a rather embarrassingly large collection of former orthodoxies of various models.39

In the New York Times Magazine of March 27, 1949, Alexander Meiklejohn had an article entitled "Should Communists be Allowed to Teach?" in which he also supported the idea that Communists should teach communism in order that there might be "fair and unabridged discussion." Hook suggests that this idea, if generalized,

... would imply that objective teaching on any issue in dispute is impossible. If anything, members of the Communist Party are prepared to suppress evidence (e.g., in their denial of the existence of Lenin's testament, the denial of the role of Trotsky in the early history of the Red Army, etc.) in accordance with the exigencies of the Kremlin's policy. "Fair and unabridged discussion" by all means. But in matters of the class struggle, which according to party doctrine pervades every aspect of our culture, the ideal of "fair" discussion is considered in Communist theory as a bourgeois illusion. "Objectivism" is in fact one of the great heresies in the international Communist movement.40

40 Ibid., p. 234.
Hook is not unlike the classicist on one point. He feels that all points of view should find expression in our educational system. But he insists that there are certain conditions which should prevail when this is done.

The academic community in one essential respect is, or should be, like the scientific community. It should be open to anyone to make a contribution. But he must play according to the rules—the laws of confirmation and evidence in the one case, and the principles of intellectual integrity in the other. A man with a private sense of evidence does not belong in a scientific community; a man who has sworn or pledged himself to follow a party line through thick and thin and insofar abandoned his freedom to think, to choose and act, does not belong in the academic community.41

Hook's Proposals

Legislative investigation on the American campuses is, from Hook's point of view, deplorable but inevitable unless the profession proceeds to police its own ranks. In place of legislative oaths he proposes a professional code.

As a first and foremost step in procedure, every faculty ought to adopt rules to which the widest publicity should be given, on the rights and responsibilities of members of the teaching staff. This would correspond somewhat to the Hippocratic credo of the medical profession. These rules should declare that membership in organizations which order their members to indoctrinate for some predetermined "line," or dictate to them which positions they must believe and teach in the fields of scholarship and science, is ipso facto a ground for dismissal. No person who subsequently is discovered to be a member of such an organization would be able to plead ignorance of the rule. In this connection the

41 Ibid., p. 173.
graduate faculty of the New School has given the lead to the entire country.  

In order to forestall legislative investigation on the campus he suggests that there be a continuing committee of the faculty, concerned with the problem of professional ethics.  

The second step in procedure would be the election of a Faculty Committee on Professional Ethics. Its function would be to receive complaints either from the faculty or administration or both and conduct investigations. Its role would not necessarily be so passive. Wherever there was evidence that a Communist group was at work, or any other group organized for unprofessional practices, it would undertake investigation on its own initiative. The specific modes of procedure will vary from place to place and from faculty to faculty, but in all cases it will culminate in a fair hearing for any teacher charged with being a member of the Communist Party. Any teacher so charged would be suspended with pay until reinstated or dismissed by decision of the Faculty Committee or governing Board at the recommendation of the Faculty Committee. No publicity would be given to the suspension or to the hearing unless requested by the teacher. He would have the privileges of counsel.  

Hook is careful to point out that what he is suggesting is not a witch hunt on campus, to be substituted for one off campus. He does not contend that dismissal would automatically follow every instance of proven or admitted Party membership. This he makes clear in the third step of his proposed procedure.  

Thirdly, admitted Communist Party membership, although prima facie evidence of unfitness and disqualification, will not automatically lead to dismissal without further consideration of the case.

---

42 Ibid., p. 262.
43 Ibid., p. 265.
and of the consequences of acting on it. There may be sufficient reason to forego taking disciplinary action against the teacher. That is to say, there may sometimes be valid grounds for retaining a person which are stronger than the valid grounds for dismissing him. In such consideration the faculty committee may deem it advisable to investigate the individual behavior of the admitted Communist Party member but in contradistinction to the position of the American Association of University Professors, this type of individual investigation will not be mandatory.44

He goes on to say,

Finally, if membership in the Communist Party is denied and then proved by the evidence of inquiry, dismissal will be automatic, since unprofessional conduct will have therewith been established by the lies and deceptions practiced by the individual in question.45

These propositions were put forth in 1953. One of the criticisms of his position, and one he tried to anticipate, was that the proposed creed would create a problem with various dogmatic religious groups. On this point Hook said:

Certainly, what is wrong for one group to do cannot be right for another. Were the Catholic Church like the Communist Party in the respects relevant for the present discussion, and were Catholic teachers organized like Communist teachers and for similar purposes in the schools, obviously what held for one would hold for the other. But the doctrine and practices of the Catholic Church differ significantly from those of the Communist Party in communities and countries in which the Catholics constitute a minority group. In such situations Catholics have justification under papal encyclicals to live under, and even enforce, certain laws which run counter to Catholic dogma. When they are minority, and where violation of their conscience is

44 Ibid., p. 265.

45 Ibid., p. 266.
not involved, they are permitted to accept and fulfill the obligations of office in a community, and to practice the "sufferance of liberties" of which they religiously disapprove as part of their duties of good citizenship.46

Opponents might raise some questions as to the nature of the "difference" between a Party order to champion civil liberties and a Papal order to "live under . . . certain laws" when in a "minority" position and when the laws do not violate one's "conscience." Hook further says:

But since we are discussing secular schools, the comparison between Communist and Catholic teachers must be rejected. One might add in addition that there has never been any evidence of the operation of Catholic cells in nonsectarian universities which impose a party line in all the arts and sciences that must be followed by Catholic teachers on pain of excommunication. The threats which emanate from certain quarters to the autonomy of the secular educational enterprise are not attributable to Catholic teachers in secular schools but to clerical influences, and not only Catholic, working outside the school.47

But a vexing problem that grows out of Hook's position is the difficult one of proving that anyone is a present member of the Communist Party. Membership cards were abandoned years ago, and since "witnesses" (defendants?) before legislative investigating committees seldom admit that they are members, the actual political status of many suspected individuals is uncertain. Many persons appearing before the legislative committees investigating communism have invoked

46 Ibid., p. 219.
47 Ibid., p. 220.
the Fifth Amendment when asked if they were now members of the Communist Party. The late Senator Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin called them "Fifth-Amendment Communists."

Many arguments have been advanced to show that invoking the privilege against self-incriminating testimony in response to a question concerning one's alleged connection with the Communist Party does not prove the "defendant" guilty of the suspected offense. As a matter of fact, when the Fifth Amendment is properly used, the question of legal guilt or innocence does not arise. Hook, recognizing that this Amendment has been stretched by many who have been called before Congressional Committees, known gangsters or suspected Communists, goes beyond the question of proven legal guilt to one of professional ethics. In Common Sense and the Fifth Amendment he contends:

Our discussion is predicated on the assumption that membership in the Communist Party unfits a person to serve his government for the same reason that membership in Murder, Inc., unfits a gangster—even if he has not yet been convicted of any crime—to serve on the police force. And for the same reason that one concludes that a man on the payroll of a real estate lobby is not qualified to fill a judiciary post, I am convinced that members of the Communist Party (and of any other party that instructs its members similarly) are unfit to teach. On these assumptions the pertinent questions to ask are (a) whether failure to answer questions about membership in the Communist Party on grounds of the Fifth Amendment establishes presumptive evidence of the fact of membership, and (b) supposing it does, what bearing has it on employability.48

48Hook, Common Sense and the Fifth Amendment, p. 78.
Hook maintains that the "inference of membership" is always involved when one invokes the Fifth Amendment in response to a question concerning membership in the Communist Party. The person may not actually belong but the "inference" that he does is valid.\(^49\)

Hook develops his position by arguing that a teacher may be within his "legal rights" and still be professionally out-of-bounds.

In situations where a teacher refuses to answer questions of a duly authorized committee of Congress, or of his colleagues, the crucial points are the kind of questions he refuses to answer and the grounds on which he refuses to answer them. Our moral evaluation of his action must rest on both of these considerations. The questions must be pertinent to his fitness to continue in his profession; and so must the implications of the grounds of his refusal to answer them. No one will contest this in other fields. If a physician is asked: "Did you recommend a risky operation because of a promise of a split fee?" or a lawyer: "Did you accept a gift from the defendant on the understanding that you would throw your client's case?" refusal to reply would lead to professional disbarment. A code of professional ethics may legitimately require an answer where the law does not.\(^50\)

He believes that a doubt arises which is of sufficient importance (regarding a teacher's professional competence when the privilege is invoked) to warrant a faculty investigation. There would never be any "automatic firing" in

---

\(^49\) Ibid., p. 90.

\(^50\) Ibid., pp. 87-88.
these cases, however, as there would be in those involving known communists.

What our analysis seems to indicate is that we must guard both against the view that no reasonable judgment of presumptive guilt or unfitness can be made in cases where the privilege is invoked, and against the view that such judgments justify automatic action, i.e., action without a hearing of some sort which will give the individual an opportunity to refute the presumption. Both views give rise to modes of action which sometimes offend our sense of justice—individual or social. If this analysis is sound it points that way to a mode of procedure which is more reasonable and more just than the alternatives of automatic dismissal or no action at all when the privilege against giving self-incriminating testimony is involved.51

On the grounds that it will reduce the misuse of the Fifth Amendment, and further the exposure of the Communist fifth column, Hook applauds the recent "immunity statute" under which the state may forego criminal prosecution of "defendants" in exchange for their information and cooperation.

Naturally, Hook's advocacy of "guilt by association," the "bad tendency" principle, "automatic firing" when the fact of being a member of the Communist party is established, and his insistence on a "freeminded" professional qualification geared to the scientific method, stirs opposition and controversy among the liberals. Hook maintains that his opponents from this quarter have failed to recognize that the reason for his basic position is the nature of the

---
51 Ibid., p. 101.
Communist conspiracy (which he is sure they do not understand). Moreover, he believes they have overlooked the qualifications and care he has used in the development of each of his stands to protect the individual who should be protected and to place all investigations in the hands of responsible faculties.

Liberals who champion a conception of "natural" and absolute civil rights have, in Hook's mind, become the victims of "popular front" psychology. It is his belief that they consider Communism a natural but somewhat zealous sect within the larger movement of liberalism, that they fail to recognize the danger of the Communist movement--that in concentrating on some of the more philosophic works of Marx and Engels (to the extent that they study any Communist literature at all) they have overlooked or blinded themselves to the hideous threat to freedom evolving out of the practical techniques of the movement under Lenin and Stalin.

The Communists, so Hook contends, are not a part of the liberal movement but a "cancerous growth upon it." Like any malignancy which will kill its host communism should be removed by the careful surgery of those capable of performing it, members of the academic profession. Anything less than this, he believes, will make the whole liberal movement suspect and to his distress, has the tendency to make the reactionaries most outlandish charges seem reasonable. It is then
that legislative intervention and prescription emerge, conditions that could lead to an end of academic freedom, indeed, to an end of the whole liberal movement.
CHAPTER IV

THE CLASSICAL POSITION

The classical position's approach to academic freedom, as was indicated in Chapter I, continues the tradition of open examination most clearly expressed by Milton and Mill. This view envisions a community of scholars who are committed, in varying degrees, to different points of view (including that of non-commitment or agnosticism). The "classicist" also feels that within the limits of ordinary human decency the scholarly decorum the teacher shall be "allowed to teach the truth as he sees it." In an article entitled "The Meanings of Academic Freedom" Max Mark describes the classical position (although he does not use this classification). He says:

It involves nothing more or less than this: an academic institution can provide an indiscriminately favorable setting for any kind of teaching, however positively or negatively it may reflect upon the existing social and political order. It implies further that society will confer recognition upon scholars solely on the basis of the sophistication of their presentations, without regard for the meaning of their views in the maintenance of the status quo. In other words, this interpretation of academic freedom assumes that an institution of society can transcend the society within which it operates. This is a startling notion. How could it have arisen?
The era of rationalism had created the belief that there was such a thing as Truth. Liberalism had added the notion that the helter-skelter of individual truths, sifted by the market place of ideas, would ultimately lead to the Truth. It will be noted that no qualification of "freemindedness" or emphasis on "scientific method" is brought forth here. Just what "sophistication" might mean is unexplained. In fact, nearly all exponents of the classical position seem vague on the question of "scholarly method or methods." It is almost as if they are aware that not all agreed on the meaning and purposes of scientific method, not on its scope or on other epistemological questions.

The pertinent question today, of course, in the area of academic freedom, is whether an "academic institution" should have on its faculty a member of the Communist Party whose teaching may reflect negatively "upon the existing social and political order." In a rather ambivalent book, entitled Academic Freedom in Our Time, Robert M. MacIver says, "... it is ridiculously shortsighted to attempt to keep students from direct acquaintance with a philosophy that has nearly half the world under its sway, or from hearing that philosophy explained by an occasional advocate of it, instead of only from those who oppose it."

---


It should be pointed out that the term "Communist Party member" is not used here—there are members and non-members who are Communists and for the sake of "scholarly appearances" the ambiguity should have been clarified. Elsewhere MacIver says,

The evidence showed convincingly that anyone who accepted without important reservations the methods and policies characteristic of the Party was not a fit and proper person for an academic position.3

If MacIver's position seems ambiguous, the same cannot be said with regard to the stand taken by Ellsworth Barnard. Barnard first points out that during the late 1940's there were stout champions of academic freedom for qualified teachers, regardless of their political affiliation and then asks regretfully:

But where today is the college or university administrator, the editorial writer, the person in any position where public opinion is important, who could afford to say that under any circumstances whatever a known Communist should be retained as a college teacher?4

Barnard indicates that some subjects, such as history and economics, may lend themselves to various interpretations and possible bias and then asks "... who shall say which is wrong and which is right?" Where distortion of "certain theories" or "data" can be proven he feels incompetence may be involved. In some of the subject matter areas, however,

3Ibid., p. 169.

Ideological conflict appears to be of negligible importance.

Barnard says,

...there are many fields of learning—linguistics, mathematics, the physical sciences—upon which Communist theory has little legitimate bearing, and in which a person committed to that theory may be as competent as anybody else. If, rarely, a case should occur in which such subjects are presented with a Communist bias (e.g., Lysenkoism in biology), this fact should be professionally detectable, like any other manifestation of professional incompetence. Be that as it may, to deprive ourselves of the professional talents of competent teachers because they are Communists does not make sense.\(^5\)

Farther on he asks, "What harm can they do?" and elsewhere says:

The general question of how far America is in danger from internal Communism need not be answered here. No one imagines that the cry "To the barricades" will ever be raised on America's campuses. No one pretends that teachers, as such, have any security secrets to give away.\(^6\)

When Barnard speaks of Communists, as the whole context of his article indicates, he refers to party members. With reference to the questions of espionage and of civil war, raised in the quotation immediately above, it must be pointed out that it is just such a possibility that Sidney Hook and J. Edgar Hoover "imagine" and "pretend" as one ground for their arguments.

The classical position, then, still has its champions in this age of near or apparent crisis. Traditionally, the exponents of this point of view have found themselves arrayed

\(^5\)Ibid., pp. 320-321.

\(^6\)Ibid., p. 325.
against the reactionaries, conservatives, and special interest groups who have sought to impose particular orthodoxies on thinking men. Given this tradition, it was natural that the classicists should suspect the movement to smoke out Communists in the mad race for complete security within the nation, to be often no more than a red herring to obscure the argument. Walter Millis, for instance, has said:

... if such suspicions proceed from an ignorance of "hard" facts one could wish that the Government could give just a few really hard facts to dispute them, rather than further repetitions of the fear-bred mythologies of the Cold War.  

The position and meaning a person takes and entertains on the question of academic freedom is frequently influenced by his view of the nature and extent of the Communist threat relative to other dangers he sees. Discussing the collective power and influence that various conservative special-interest groups, with the able assistance of educational vigilantes (such as Allen A. Zoll) and certain publicity-hungry politicians, had developed MacIver said,

... it is our deliberate judgment that their operations are a more serious menace to the integrity of our educational institutions than the machinations of the handful of communists who may still be found within them. The great body of educators and the whole structure of educational authority can take care of the latter, whenever any need arises. But these other organizations are frequently high-powered, backed by much

---

Influence and wealth, often possessed of social prestige, and above all operating in close alliance with a group of ambitious politicians, Their power to do harm is proportionately great.8

Alan Barth, also emphasizing the threat from the right, said "Nothing that the agents of communism have done or can do in this country is so dangerous to the United States as what they had induced us, through the Americanists, to do to ourselves."9 Elsewhere he said:

... Anti-communism is in danger of becoming as doctrinaire as communism—and of embracing its root evil, intolerance. To deny men freedom in any form on the pretext that they themselves are not free is to put freedom into the strait-jacket of orthodoxy.10

In addition to feeling that the traditional foes—conservatives and reactionaries—represent the greater threat to American liberty, there is a feeling, also, that the right to think and learn, as well as the right to speak or remain silent according to the dictates of one's own conscience, are the supporting columns of the whole pantheon of liberty. Any breach of civil liberty at these points may bring down the entire structure. Thus, Dwight L. Bolinger, arguing for a university market-place of ideas and against the policy of exclusion, has said:

It is not surprising that more than one college faculty has agreed with what at first sight looks

8Iver, op. cit., p. 62.
10Tbid., p. 232.
to be a clean and logical broom to sweep its own ranks of the intellectually dishonest and the conspiratorial few. Unused to the traps of compromise on matters of principle, they have let themselves suppose that the penalties are inflicted on intellectual dishonesty, not on political misbehavior. Communism may be a cause, but it is not the reason.

But the logical consequence is nothing less than the ferreting out of all causes of intellectual unfreedom. The intellectual purist would need to establish a scale of affinities by which the ideal detachment is weakened through attachment to anything—one's family for nepotism, one's religion for bigotry, one's bank account for conservatism. Yet this is exactly what no purist is doing, and it proves how fraudulent, or at least inconsistent, prattle about intellectual freedom is. . . .

Alan Barth also pointed up the danger of allowing any concessions regarding freedom of speech. The Immigration Act of 1918 had forbidden aliens, seeking to enter the United States, the right to teach or advocate the overthrow of the government. In 1940 the Alien Registration Act extended the prohibition to all Americans. Barth says:

It is no accident that this repression was achieved through an amendment to a statute nominally aimed only at aliens. The extension of this restraint on advocacy from the few to the many is an object lesson in the danger of countenancing any encroachment on liberty. Those who imprison the helpless are likely in the end to find themselves inside the walls they have erected.12

Dean Erwin N. Griswold, in his booklet The Fifth Amendment Today, defends the "dignity of the individual" and his


12Barth, op. cit., p. 103.
right to silence. The Fifth Amendment has proven to be an effective, but always disturbing, instrument in preventing extensive probes by the "congressional headshrinkers." In defending the need for its inviolability Dean Griswold also cites the danger of a chain reaction from a breach of liberty here.

If we are not willing to let the Amendment be invoked, where, over time, are we going to stop when police, prosecutors, or chairmen want to get people to talk? Lurking in the background here are really ugly dangers which might transform our whole system of free government. In this light, the frustrations caused by the Amendment are a small price to pay for the fundamental protection it provides.13

MacIver, too, indicates the danger of spreading inquisition and orthodoxy.

The attack on academic freedom weakens at the core the security of other freedoms, freedoms that men dare not openly assail. If the conclusions of the scholar are curbed, how can the opinions of the layman, when he is not a member of some dominant group, be safeguarded? If textbooks are rigorously censored, how can the books the public read be protected? What has been happening already shows how inseparable academic freedom is from other freedoms. Other books than textbooks are being thrown out of libraries. Private censorial committees are doing business and asking for new laws and new police activities. It is not only the academy that is being "investigated" but every other kind of organization from the purging of which the inquisitors are not deterred by the fear of losing votes. . . . It is the freedom of opinion everywhere they would curb. And if they curb it enough, they will destroy democracy. For democracy not only guarantees the freedom of opinion: it needs the free diversity of opposing opinions in order to exist.14

14MacIver, op. cit., pp. 256-257.
The argument concerning the inviolability of these key liberties has been extensively developed at this point because (1) the liberties are important and (2) the argument, along with the one concerning the greater-danger-from-the-right, seems to be an influencing factor with regard to many of the stands taken and arguments advanced by advocates of the classical position.

It is easy to see that the classicists are afraid of a further encroachment on liberty wherever a breakthrough occurs. It is undoubtedly because of the firmness of their stand and the frequent appearance of the argument that Hook (in effect) accuses them of the "black or white fallacy" and of championing "absolute rights."

In the professional and public furor which developed out of the University of Washington cases (discussed in Chapter III) champions of an "open system" raised many questions concerning the charges of the "suppressionists." One such question dealt with the size of the Communist Party. It seems to have varied from around 7,500 after the Russian purge trials during 1936-38 to around 80,600 during the World War II alliance with Russia. After Czechoslovakia fell into the Communist orbit, the Party lost many members; later J. Edgar Hoover reported its strength at around twenty-five thousand. What kind of threat could such a small political party pose in a nation of 160 million, some classicists wanted to know. In response to a remark by Herbert
Brownell that "small Communist groups" in other countries had been known to expand "swiftly to millions." Walter Millis said:

Brownell cannot seriously believe there is a danger of the Eisenhower Administration, or any possible successor, creating in this country "favorable situations" comparable to those in Russia, China, or even Italy. What he really thinks perhaps comes out in the remark that if there were "only a handful of Communists" among us they "would still present a danger because they are dedicated to overthrowing our way of life"—because, in other words, they are heretics, rather than because of any substantive damage which the heresy is capable of doing.15

While some may have felt that never before in history "had so many been thrown into panic by so few," Mr. Hoover (as late as 1958) warned,

The present menace of the Communist Party in the United States grows in direct ratio to the rising feeling that it is a small, dissident element and need not be feared. As we relax our protection and ease up on security measures, we move closer and closer to a "fool's paradise."16

Another question raised during the University of Washington case was whether or not the American Communist Party actually advocated revolution. On that point the majority report stated:

It is a matter of dispute whether the Communist Party, U.S.A., advocates the seizure of power in this country by force and violence. The writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin appear to indicate that seizure of power anywhere by force

15Millis, op. cit., p. 33.

is a part of the fundamental Communist program and perhaps the only effective means of obtaining power. Some of the earlier writings of American Communists took the same line. Currently, however, the Communist Party, U.S.A., consistently denies any such intent, asserting rather that it seeks power only by constitutional means after winning a majority of the population to its support. The foreign and earlier American writings suggesting a different view are, it is claimed, to be explained on the theory that they were meant to apply to conditions in other countries or times. We believe it probable that propaganda for forcible seizure of power has been abandoned in this country largely because Communist Party leaders are convinced that such methods would be highly unpopular and might lead to immediate outlawing of the Party and because they believe that such a program has, for the immediate future, no real prospect of success.17

Did the Communist Party of America take "orders" from Moscow? The complainant in the Washington case urged that the respondents, by virtue of being secret members of a party which was "actually controlled by a foreign power," were enemies of the nation. The majority report contended:

It is also a matter of dispute whether the Communist Party, U.S.A., is directly controlled from Russia or by a World Communist organization. Objectively, there appears much to support this view. The Communist Party presently denies that this is so, taking the position that uniformity of action and thought here and abroad is the natural and normal result of a common philosophy rather than of obedience to direct commands. . . . We believe the difference to be insubstantial. The ultimate fact is that American Communists defend and follow the Russian and world Communist programs in almost every detail. Whether this identity of thought and policy results from following orders from abroad, or from a blind and automatic imitation, or as the natural consequence of a common philosophy does not alter

the fact that the Party consistently does support Russian and world Communist programs rather than those supported by the overwhelming majority of people in this country.\textsuperscript{18}

On this same question of foreign control a minority report stated:

There is much evidence in the record bearing on the nature of the Communist Party, some of which supports this contention and some of which points the other way. But, as we pointed out above, we are not trying the Communist Party.\textsuperscript{19}

The question of rigid and complete Party discipline had also been raised during the proceedings. On this point Professors Rex Robinson, John Sholley, and J. Richard Huber (authors of a minority report) said that

\textquote{\ldots we find in the record nothing to support the allegations, other than general statements of the duty of all Party members to follow policy determinations made by the national leadership, and testimony that disobedient Party functionaries are from time to time expelled. Against this, respondents testified that they had never been subjected to discipline, that they felt free to do their own thinking and reach their own conclusions, and that they remained in the Party through personal conviction and not from fear of persecution.}\textsuperscript{20}

Alexander Meiklejohn discussed the "Washington Controversy" and the question of Party-enforced thought-control in an article entitled "Professors on Probation." He said,

In a press interview, Mr. Allen is quoted as saying, "I insist that the Communist party exercises thought control over every one of its

\textsuperscript{18} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 32.

\textsuperscript{19} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 47.

\textsuperscript{20} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 45.
members. That's what I object to." Such teachers, he tells us, are "incompetent, intellectually dishonest, and derelict in their duty to find and teach the truth." Can those assertions be verified? If so, then the tenure code should be amended. If not, then the action of the university should be immediately and decisively reversed.\(^2\)

In exploring the validity of Allen's position Meiklejohn noted that in Russia where the communists exercised state power they could enforce Party decrees by "police and military might." But Meiklejohn asks how this could occur in the United States.

... by what form of "might" do they control an American university? What can they do to him? At its extreme limit, their only enforcing action is that of dismissal from the party. They can say to him, "You cannot be a member of this party unless you believe our doctrines, unless you conform to our policies." But, under that form of control, a man's acceptance of doctrines and policies is not "required." It is voluntary.\(^2\)

Meiklejohn argues further, somewhat naively it would appear, that if one enters the party of his own free will then his "beliefs are free." And furthermore, he contends, one can always leave the party.

Three of the five men whom they condemned as enslaved by party orders had already, by their own free and independent thinking, resigned from the party. How could they have done that if, as charged, they were incapable of free and independent thinking? Slaves do not resign.\(^2\)

---


\(^{22}\)Ibid., p. 717.

\(^{23}\)Ibid., p. 718.
This whole line of reasoning may appear weak in light of the subsequent investigations and the effect of the Twentieth Communist Party Congress on the American Communists. It must be pointed out, however, that members of the 1922 to 1925 Workers Party of America, as well as members of any of the Communist Parties organized in the United States after 1937, might (as far as any constitutional documents are concerned) claim voluntary association and deny any knowledge of revolutionary intent or decisive foreign control. Proof that such an individual's claim was false would have to rest on other evidence or knowledge.

One of the most important supports of civil liberty under our law is the tradition of requiring that guilt be established on the basis of personally committed acts. On this point Justice Robert H. Jackson wrote:

Only in the darkest periods of human history has any Western government concerned itself with mere belief, however eccentric or mischievous, when it has not matured into overt action; and if the practice survives anywhere, it is in the Communist countries whose philosophies we loathe.24

Liberals have upheld this principle with unusual persistence. It provides a barricade against the twin dangers of thought-control and guilt-by-association. Robert M. Hutchins touches

---

on this problem in an article, "The Freedom of the University."

I know very little about the inner working of the Communist party in America. It is represented to us as a conspiracy, with everybody in it under iron discipline, which I take to mean that a member has given up the privilege of independent thought and has surrendered himself entirely to the party. If this is so, a member of the Communist party cannot qualify as a member of the university community in any field that is touched by the party. . . .

But what if we should find a member of the Communist party who in spite of this presumption did think independently? The fact of membership cannot and should not disqualify him from membership in the faculty of a university in view of the additional fact that he does not act as members of the party are supposed to act. I cannot insist too strongly that the primary question in every case is what is this individual man himself, not what are the beliefs and activities of his relatives, associates, and acquaintances. The beliefs and activities of others may be relevant if the beliefs and activities of the individual are in dispute. They may then afford some evidence of what the beliefs and activities of the individual are. But, when the life of the individual has been exposed before us for many years, and when he has neither acted nor taught subversively, the doctrine of guilt by association can have slight value.25

The American Association of University Professors in an official resolution passed in March of 1952 held that:

Experience has abundantly demonstrated that neither the organizational affiliations of a teacher, if lawful, nor his social, economic, political or religious opinions, however difficult for others to understand and however distasteful to others they may be, are sufficient evidence of disqualification for work in the academic profession. The acceptance of the contrary view leads logically to nondisloyalty test oaths, and to inquisitions into the beliefs of

individuals and into the affairs of colleges and universities, both of which are inimical to the American way of life and our institutions of higher education. Such consequences make clear the importance of the observance of the principle that unprofessional conduct or unlawful acts which might disqualify one for academic work are personal, and can be dealt with justly only in a proceeding directed to the individual teacher.  

A slight qualification to the principle of "personal guilt" is the idea of a "clear and present danger." This position was most sharply stated in the oft-quoted opinion of Justice Louis D. Brandeis.

To courageous, self-reliant men, with confidence in the power of free and fearless reasoning applied through the processes of popular government, no danger flowing from speech can be deemed clear and present, unless the incidence of the evil apprehended is so imminent that it may befall before there is opportunity for full discussion. If there be time to expose through discussion the falsehood and fallacies, to avert the evil by the processes of education, the remedy to be applied is more speech, not enforced silence. Only an emergency can justify repression.  

Police power could be exercised under this doctrine before overt acts are committed but only when the conditions constituted an imminent threat to public health morals or safety. The "clear and present danger" principle has found frequent use over the years but a counter principle--that of


27 Louis D. Brandeis, quoted in Alan Barth, The Loyalty of Free Men, p. 21.
the bad tendency--has been used twice. In reviewing the

case of Benjamin Gitlow the court majority said:

It cannot be said that the State is acting arbitrarily or unreasonably when in the exercise of its judgment as to the measures necessary to protect the public peace and safety, it seeks to extinguish the spark without waiting until it has enkindled the flame or blazed into the conflagration. It cannot reasonably be required to defer the adoption of measures for its own peace and safety until the revolutionary utterances lead to actual disturbances of the public peace or imminent and immediate danger of its own destruction; but it may, in the exercise of its judgment, suppress the threatened danger in its incipiency. . .

. . . In other words, when the legislative body has determined generally, in the constitutional exercise of its discretion, that utterances of a certain kind involve such danger of substantive evil that they may be punished, the question whether any specific utterance coming within the prohibited class is likely, in and of itself, to bring about the substantive evil, is not open to consideration.28

In other words, certain statements declared offensive by state law or, as in the case of the Smith Act by national law, can be suppressed regardless of any immediate danger. Under the Smith Act, it is true, it must be shown the defendant had the "intent to cause" overthrow of the government. Laurence Sears says "What this statement means is that there are certain books by Marx, Lenin, and Stalin that cannot be taught by those who believe the doctrines expressed."29

28 The People Shall Judge (United States Supreme Court, Gitlow v. New York), p. 646.

In the early 1950's many educators feared a retreat from the principles of personal guilt and clear and present danger. This retreat, in the face of numerous reactionary excesses, caused a mounting fear of national orthodoxy in educational circles. News media continuously featured the witch-hunting of the period and each day brought more excited demands for an "educational housecleaning." With precision David Spitz pointed to the reason why many non-communist educators were disturbed.

. . . in this age of anxiety, when men in power see their values and the very assumptions of their power system questioned, they look ever more suspiciously at the principle of free inquiry. They tend to be less tolerant of educators who persist in examining sacred doctrine. They seek through non-disloyalty disclaimers and other means to constrain the processes of thought. But they forget that if free inquiry is a way of discovering truth it is also a way of discovering error, and that to curb free inquiry is to proclaim heretical not error but a method of discovering error.30

Some educators refused to yield to legalized hysteria. In Illinois, Robert T. Harris, who refused to sign the Broyles Oath, later explained why.

The greatest damage of all done by the Broyles oath is the invisible damage, the timidity instilled into the minds of fearful teachers throughout the State, who feel that they have been let down and made to submit to the yoke of political pressure. The greatest damage is in the minds of professors who, in their classes, attend not to what is true but to what is safe.31

---

30 Ibid., p. 68.

If these are the facts, one is inclined to say, by paraphrase, blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the University.

Many had given up on the question of personal guilt where Party Communists were concerned and were resigned to their categorical treatment. But then chiefly because of the turn of a phrase by former Senator Joseph McCarthy, the "Fifth Amendment Communist" became an object of investigation and the danger arose of an expanding system of repression. The Fifth Amendment was intended to prevent a man from being forced by torture to reveal guilt which could not otherwise be established. This concern is in some ways related to the idea that a man is innocent until he is proven guilty and that the burden of proof rests with the prosecution.

Erwin N. Griswold has shown several reasons why a non-Communist might use the Fifth Amendment. He might be frightened of a public probe into other aspects of his personal life. He could be confused, or afraid he might establish a link in a chain of evidence to some unnamed crime, or he might do it on advice of council. If he is a former Communist, he might incorrectly invoke the Amendment, with regard to himself, in order to block a further probe into the lives of associates. Griswold asks:

What does a person do when he finds himself summoned before a legislative committee in which he has no confidence? In recent experience, this has often been a one-man sub-committee, where the witness finds presiding a legislator who is judge,
jury, prosecutor, castigator, and press agent, all in one. Our witness is not a lawyer. He has not thought these things through in great detail. He has read about the Fifth Amendment in the papers, and he may have received advice about it from his lawyer—and is it not his lawyer's duty to give him such advice? The witness is frightened by the publicity to which he has been subjected, by the TV cameras and lights, by the noise and confusion, and especially by the excesses which he sees before him. He has no confidence in the proceeding. In this situation, he takes refuge in the Fifth Amendment. It will not do, I think, to say that this is not realistic. . . .

In this circumstance, is it sound to take the inference that the man who refuses to answer questions, especially questions as to his past beliefs and opinions, on the ground of self-incrimination, is guilty of something heinous or else is a liar? I do not think that it is.32

Elsewhere he cautions, "The claim of the privilege is surely a serious business, but it is equally surely not the equivalent of an admission of criminal conduct."33

Sidney Hook, of course, has never maintained that criminal guilt could be inferred when the privilege is invoked. He does maintain that its use raises serious question concerning one's moral fitness for a position of public trust but, as was noted earlier, he does not advocate automatic dismissal in such cases. Not all college administrations were so circumspect, however, as Alan Barth points out.

In many institutions of higher learning, suspension or summary dismissal became an automatic reaction to a Fifth Amendment plea by any member of the faculty. The effect was to put into the hands of the Internal Security Sub-committee a powerful

32Griswold, op. cit., p. 67.
33Ibid., p. 19.
device for determining the membership of these university faculties—something which is supposed to be determined by the universities themselves.\(^{34}\)

Further, Robert M. MacIver, at one point, attacks the whole basis of Congressional investigation of college and university faculties.

The Report of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, entitled "Subversive Influence in the Educational Process," justifies its investigations of colleges and universities on grounds we find wholly untenable. "Our purpose," said Senator Jenner, "is to protect and safeguard academic freedom." Almost in the next breath he declares "there can be no academic freedom until this Soviet conspiracy hidden in our schools and colleges is exposed to the light." We hold this statement to be a total misrepresentation of the facts. We specifically deny that the situation in our colleges and universities constitutes a "national danger." We specifically deny that in these institutions "academic freedom is under attack by a monstrous growth no individual or community of scholars can fight alone."\(^{35}\)

Elsewhere he says,

The faculty taken as a whole has one unifying objective, the pursuit of knowledge and its dissemination; one faith in common, the belief in the worthwhileness of the pursuit. Therefore it is merely ridiculous when a body of political investigators claims that when it turns its attention to the colleges it has the grand aim of defending academic freedom. . . . The faculty is quite able and alone qualified to defend the institution from any such danger from within. It is for the law and the guardians of the law to defend it from dangers from without.\(^{36}\)

\(^{34}\)Barth, "When Congress Investigates," p. 23.

\(^{35}\)MacIver, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 193.

\(^{36}\)\textit{Ibid.}, p. 255.
The House Committee on Un-American Activities addressed itself to the argument MacIver presented above.

One of the principal criticisms raised in connection with the investigations and hearings by the House Committee on Un-American Activities is that Universities are themselves capable of detecting which teachers are Communists. The fallacy of this criticism is exemplified by the facts relating to [Professor X. X], as were other witnesses, was identified under oath as a one-time member of the Communist Party prior to the time that he was served with a subpoena by an investigator for the committee. When he was first contacted by the investigator, [X] arranged for an interview in the office of the dean of the University of [Y], and further arranged that the head of the department in which he was an instructor be present. In the presence of these university officials, [X] flatly denied that he had ever been a member of the Communist Party. In the intervening period between that conference and his appearance before the committee, [X] was publicly identified by three witnesses as a one-time member of the Communist Party. When he did appear before the committee, [X] refused to affirm or deny membership in the Communist Party on the grounds that to do so might incriminate him.37

While proof of Party affiliation in this case is surely open to question, one is tempted to ask Mr. MacIver if Congress, when derogatory information is recorded, should leave such cases unprobed, hoping that someday the University will discover it? After many pages of constant censure of Congressional committees, MacIver does recognize a place for such committees in our national life.

We have not questioned the right of congressional committees to carry on whatsoever investigations

are officially entrusted to their charge. We have not questioned their legal and constitutional authority to hunt for subversives—so long as they give a rational definition to the term—in our colleges and universities. We have questioned their judgment, their discretion, their methods, their assumptions, their announced objectives—and notably their claim to be defending academic freedom.38

This would seem to indicate that all Mr. MacIver intends to assert, though this is quite a lot, is the autonomy of the profession in making decisions regarding academic freedom, rules of tenure, and professional conduct.

The Un-American Activities Committee has always been subjected to criticism. One charge has been that it is frequently used as a springboard to political power (the rise of Vice-President Nixon from membership in the House of Representatives is often cited as an example). Another charge is that it is often used for partisan advantage. Alan Barth pointed to this tendency during the investigations and trial of Alger Hiss.

In this embittered conflict there was no room for doubt as to the sympathies of the Un-American Activities Committee. In one of the most revealing interchanges of the long proceedings, the chairman, J. Parnell Thomas, said to John Rankin, "You know, Mr. Rankin, well down deep in your heart that this Committee is not going to whitewash anybody or anything, and you also know that this Committee has done a very big job—a very big job—and especially a big job in the last two years. We have been unearthing your New Dealers for two years, and for eight years before that."39

---

38 MacIver, op. cit., p. 267.

39 Barth, The Loyalty of Free Men, p. 91.
In brief, under Chairman Thomas, the Democrats were to be smeared with treason if possible.

Other accusations have been that the witnesses are not given a statement concerning the charges against them, that secret informers are used and that one cannot cross-examine his accusers. In 1953, Mr. Louis Ivens refused to testify as to whether or not he was a member of the American Youth for Democracy and then insisted that he be allowed to confront his accuser with a sworn statement. The report of the Committee reveals the following exchange.

MR. VELDE. Let me disabuse your mind that you are being accused of anything. You were called here to give us some information relative to Communist activities in the Philadelphia area. This is not a court of law. You are not being accused of a thing. This is a congressional committee, directed by the Congress of the United States, to gather information, to report to Congress for the purposes of remedial legislation, and it is not a court of law in any sense of the word.

MR. CLARDY. Bear this in mind, we are giving you an opportunity to state the facts as you see them, even though you have seen fit to suppress the television and tried to suppress the radio and other means of communication. We are giving you your opportunity before anyone testifies publicly concerning you. You have not chosen to avail yourself of it. I am indeed sorry and I am amazed that you do not understand why we are doing this instead of bringing someone to name you first.

MR. KUNZIG. May I continue?

MR. VELDE. Yes.

MR. KUNZIG. Mr. Ivens, on July 8, 1947, did you attend a Communist Party street meeting at American and Poplar Streets in Philadelphia where you were one of the principal speakers?

MR. IVENES. I refuse to answer that question and I invoke the fifth amendment.
MR. KUNZIG. The committee is in possession of sworn testimony, Mr. Chairman, that such was the fact.\textsuperscript{40}

This would seem to confirm the accusation regarding lack of a statement of charges and cross examination, and of the use of secret informers. Although Ivens was not accused of anything, and was given the opportunity to be a witness before anyone testified against him publicly, the committee soon produced sworn testimony against him. The television mentioned could only be suppressed after witnesses had been sworn in before it.

It is possible that Congressional committees may properly operate in the manner described; but such practices seem to run counter to liberties Americans thought they had, and indeed do have, in a court of law. Writing of the manner in which the Committee on Un-American Activities conducts its business Allan Barth said:

Numerous attempts have been made to correct its commonly acknowledge excesses by reforming its procedure. But the real defect lies deeper than this. It is an incurable defect. It is rooted in the purpose for which the committee was created and in the concept that Congress may properly punish, by publicity, activities which it cannot constitutionally declare criminal.

The effect of this committee, from its inception, has been to censor and to penalize political and economic ideas of which its members disapproved. And this effect has been achieved equally under Republican and Democratic auspices.\textsuperscript{41}


\textsuperscript{41}Barth, \textit{The Loyalty of Free Men}, p. 55.
Although Barth believes the committee to suffer from an incurable defect, he says, in a summary of its merits and demerits:

It must be credited with having promoted awareness of the evil purposes of the Communist Party and with having put the public on its guard against a number of organizations carrying on the party's work under false labels. It must also be credited with having exposed, in 1948, certain prewar espionage activities within the government...

But in its treatment of the Communist Party it so grossly distorted and exaggerated the danger as to inspire panic rather than realism. By denouncing liberal individuals and progressive measures as "communistic," it spread confusion rather than caution. By punishing unorthodox opinion, it put a halter on expression, making Americans wary of what they say, wary of their associations, in ways that are incongruous to a free people. Such results, quite apart from their injury to innocent individuals, impair rather than promote national security. \(^\text{42}\)

Turning to the loyalty and security programs Barth indicated that harrassment of unorthodox thinking tends to cause many creative scientists to turn away from government service in vital defense and research projects. Loyalty boards have frequently used the "derogatory information" contained in Congressional and Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) files in determining the disposition of cases before them. Referring to certain unproven charges against Dr. Edward U. Condon, Barth contended:

The effect of this assault on a distinguished scientist's integrity--and of the numerous assaults on less distinguished scientists--cannot be quantitatively reckoned. The open-house invitation extended by legislative investigators to every

\(^{42}\text{Ibid.}, p. 75.\)
renegade Communist and stool pigeon, and the eager credence given their sensational allegations, operate as a powerful deterrent to security by achievement.

One way in which a foreign power might seek to cripple the American atomic energy program would be to single out a few of the country's foremost nuclear physicists—there are not so very many—and dispose of them by assassination. . . .

But murder is a messy, awkward business. The assassins might be caught and executed; the plot might be discerned before it could be completed. Moreover, it is quite unnecessary. How much more simply the same results can be achieved by a few words craftily spoken before some legislative committee or whispered anonymously to an FBI investigator! Character assassination is at once easier and surer than physical assault; and it involves far less risk for the assassin. 43

In 1954 the Gray Board, investigating various charges developed against J. Robert Oppenheimer, found him, though loyal, to be a security risk. An ex-communist had testified against Oppenheimer in California. Oppenheimer denied the charges and seems to have candidly revealed to General Leslie Groves, who supervised the Manhattan Project, that he had been approached by Soviet Agents. This was during the World War II. Such a candid relationship hardly seems to reveal clandestine espionage.

What then is a loyal security risk? Did the Gray Board assume that Oppenheimer was addleheaded or that he might do the Communist Party's bidding because of a blackmail threat? A look at one criterion used by the Board in making

its decision reveals that it assumed a man's ideas toward defense to be important.

In evaluating advice from a specialist which departs from the area of his specialty, officials must also be certain that underlying any advice is a genuine conviction that this country cannot in the interests of security have less than the strongest possible offensive capabilities in a time of national danger.\textsuperscript{44} 

Presumably a scientist who might contribute greatly to the defense effort could be excluded if he favored more aid to Point Four than to the Strategic Air Command, or if he opposed the development of "dirty" bombs. Harry S. Truman has remarked "We cannot drive scientists into our laboratories, but, if we tolerate reckless or unfair attacks, we can certainly drive them out."\textsuperscript{45}

Louis Joughin of the American Civil Liberties Union, in an article entitled "Scrutiny of Professors" quotes section 6-1 of the present \textit{Industrial Security Manual} which also applies to the teaching profession.

\textit{The contractor shall submit immediately to the cognizant security office . . . \{a\} report on any employee working in any of his plants, factories, or sites where work for a Military Department is being performed and when the information is needed in connection with an official investigation of possible or probable compromise of classified information.\} Such report will only be submitted when the written request of the cognizant security}

\textsuperscript{44}Gray Board, "Statement of General Considerations" quoted in \textit{Time} June 14, 1954, p. 27.

\textsuperscript{45}Barth, \textit{Loyalty of Free Men}, p. 211.
officer states the report is needed in connection with an official investigation. Mr. Joughin fears this opens the doors for indiscriminate snooping into the lives of all professors who happen to be on a campus (site) where military or security work is carried on. He says,

For a world authority in the field of biological mutations to discover that a university president is in a position to deliver part or all of his dossier to a security office lays a foundation for profound displeasure. From a strictly practical point of view, government authority should consider the negative result of an accumulation of such displeasures.

The FBI is one source to which Congress and Loyalty Boards frequently turn, hence, an analysis of the nature and methods of their counter-espionage activities is in order. J. Edgar Hoover has said:

Counterespionage assignments of the FBI require an objective different from the handling of criminal cases. In a criminal case, the identification and arrest of the wrongdoer are the ultimate objectives. In an espionage case, the identification of a wrongdoer is only the first step. What is more important is to ascertain his contacts, his objectives, his sources of information, and his methods of communication. Arrest and public disclosure are steps to be taken only as a matter of last resort. It is better to know who these people are and what they are doing and to immobilize their efforts, than it is to expose them publicly and then go through the tireless efforts of identifying their successors.

---


47 Ibid., pp. 208-209.

When public disclosure was occurred, the FBI has naturally wanted to keep its sources of information confidential.

Barth points out:

The FBI is understandably reticent about its sources of information. Given discretion to withhold the identity of its informants, it naturally tends to do so whenever that seems expedient. It solicits information from all sorts of persons on a confidential basis; and when it designates its source by some cryptic symbol such as T-13, the loyalty board reading its report has no independent means of knowing whether this source is a paragon of veracity, a knave, or the village idiot. ⁴⁹

This, of course, leads to many problems for the witnesses who are called in to give information to Loyalty Boards and Congressional Committees. What was not so obvious to the investigators (and to the FBI) were the problems the informer system created for them! Harvey Matusow's False Witness proved that naivety was not exclusively a liberal's disease.

Barth (as Hook has noted) takes a rather strong position with regard to the FBI and the whole security program. The problem began, according to Barth, when President Roosevelt issued a directive in 1939 which gave the FBI counter-espionage duties in addition to its police work. Barth says,

The lumping together in a single agency of responsibility for investigation of conventional crime and of espionage, sabotage, subversive activities, and disloyalty has produced some extremely unhappy confusions. The investigation of conventional crime entails the detection and apprehension

⁴⁹Ibid., pp. 113-114.
of persons who have committed overt unlawful acts; it is the normal proper business of a law-enforcement agency. The fruits of such investigation are turned over to prosecutors who present them to courts; and those proved guilty are punished in accordance with the law. Counterespionage and countersabotage may be preventive as well as punitive; they are concerned with the detection, surveillance, and frustration of spies and saboteurs much more than with their immediate arrest and prosecution. This is more an intelligence operation than a police operation. The investigation of subversive activities and of disloyalty is not a police operation at all—save in those countries where political police are countenanced.50

Out of the 1939 directive have flowed, according to Barth, the complex machinery of investigation, inquiry into beliefs, the informer system, secret witnesses, and McCarthyism.

All that McCarthy did was to carry to its cynical extreme the debasement of American values begun by the administration for lofty purposes. McCarthyism is an illustration of the force of the argument ad horrendum. The river is liable to flow quite beyond control once the dam has been breached.51

Barth is dubious about the increasing political importance of ex-FBI agents in various levels of government work and of the mounting number of secret files which, under men less honorable than Mr. Hoover, might constitute a great threat to liberty and human life.

The contents of some of the files are leaked occasionally—it would seem almost necessarily with the connivance of someone in the FBI itself—to congressional investigators and to newspaper reporters. A portion of the FBI's loyalty report on Dr. Edward U. Condon, for instance, was made

50 Ibid., pp. 160-161.
51 Ibid., p. 138.
public by Representative J. Parnell Thomas. The FBI, like any other government agency, has its turnover of personnel. There are indications that some former FBI agents have made use for private purposes of their knowledge of the bureau's files. The weekly newsletter called *Counterattack*, published by former agents of the FBI, sometimes exhibits a remarkable knowledge of the private activities and associations of persons it "exposes" as "Reds." And there is the possibility, finally, that some FBI alumni will use their memories of FBI files for blackmail or for political pressure. Buried in rows upon rows of jealously guarded steel filing cabinets, these dossiers rest like little guided missiles, each with its designated target, waiting to be launched toward the destruction of a reputation and a human life.52

Sidney Hook contends that this argument, in effect, calls for the abandonment of the whole loyalty and security program at a time when we are confronted by an international conspiracy. Hook agrees with the argument advanced by some that "if any criminal acts are performed we can take care of it by legal means." He insists, however, that there are some positions which demand more of a person than non-criminality.

If some of the arguments of the classical position seem extreme, they should be placed against the background of our previous alliance with the Soviet Union in a common war against the Facists and against the terrifying rise of McCarthyism. As Hook may be misunderstood by those who have underestimated the Communist threat, so may the classicists be misunderstood by those who are insensitive to the profession's tradition of liberty and the overpowering need to

---

keep the channels of communication open as we strive to live together more fully in an age of missiles and automation. In the spring of 1955 Dwight L. Bolinger, writing in the light of this tradition, summarized his conception of what a university should be as follows:

The university has many tasks, but one mission: to confer citizenship in the republic of ideas. It does not require a university to do this. One gifted tutor is enough; but to accomplish it he must himself be that republic in microcosm. Ordinarily, and with ordinary mortals, it takes a full community of tutors, representing all shades of ideas, mostly moderate, but some extreme, with opposite extremes balancing each other and providing the student with a choice and a challenge. If he is challenged to fight back, so much the better for him, and if he is deprived of this whetstone of the intellect, so much the worse for the university that has cheated him of his birthright. In microcosm the individual tutor cannot close his mind, and in macrocosm the tutorial community cannot close its ranks, lest it become the tool of some policy rather than an instrument of intellectual fruition.53

Proposals of the Classicists

Perhaps, as Hook believes, Alan Barth does want to "abandon the whole security program." A second look, however, would seem to indicate that the qualification, "as it now stands," should be added. Barth does not seem to have abandoned the idea of some form of security system. At one point he says:

The most serious danger growing out of Communist activities in the United States is the possibility that the Communists—or some of them—might serve

53 Bolinger, op. cit., p. 18.
as a fifth column in case of war between this
country and Russia. Espionage, direct physical
sabotage, disruption of transportation and com-
munications, and violation of air-raid protection
rules might be attempted. Such acts would, of
course, constitute treason in the strict constitu-
tional sense of the term and could have disastrous
consequences. Ordinary prudence suggests that it
would be better, if possible, to prevent them than
to punish them.54

At another point he says:

At a time of international tension, particularly
at a time when Russian agents are known to be active
in this country, a vigilant and skilled counter-
intelligence corps is an indispensable element of
national security. It is a reasonable question,
however, whether national security is best pro-
tected by entrusting so delicate a function to a
police force—even to so expert a police force as
the FBI. In England it is entrusted not to Scotland
Yard but to a special branch of the military.
Counterintelligence calls for knowledge, skills,
training, and techniques altogether different from
those required for the detection of conventional
crime. It calls, to begin with, for almost abso-
lute anonymity on the part of the head of the corps
as well as on the part of its agents. It calls
for familiarity with a world wholly different from
the underworld of crime. It calls for the highest
kind of political sophistication—something which
even the best of policemen is unlikely to possess.55

Unfortunately, Mr. Barth fails to develop his ideas for this
phase of security much farther. He is frankly more inter-
ested in the recruitment of superior individuals for govern-
ment service.

The government needs trustworthy, intelligent,
tough-minded, and devoted workers. Finding them
is essentially a recruitment problem. It ought
to be approached, therefore, in terms of a search

54Barth, Loyalty of Free Men, p. 43.
55Ibid., p. 161.
for affirmative, desired qualities rather than in terms of a negative policy of exclusion. For the government, as for any private employer, the best index to an applicant's capabilities is his record of past performance. That record ought to be scrutinized in every case with great care. . . .

Most important of all—just as it is most important in the personnel work of any private enterprise—the applicant should be interviewed at first hand both by personnel officers of the agency and by the particular official under whom he is to serve, with a view toward determining his attitudes respecting the policies and functions of the agency. It is important to select persons enthusiastic about the work they are to do.56

It may be that the deliberate attempt to determine "attitudes respecting the policies and functions of the agency" would promote mediocrity and orthodoxy rather than the intelligence and tough-mindedness Barth finds desirable.

Concerning reforms needed in the area of Congressional investigations, Robert K. Carr has suggested the possibility of organizational reforms, such as the creation of Permanent Investigation Committees similar to the English Royal Commission of Inquiry. A committee of this nature would be composed of civil service experts and/or private citizens qualified to investigate problems in areas of their competence. Such an organization, Carr feels could serve as an alternative to the "partisanship and prejudice which marks many a congressional committee."57

56 Ibid., pp. 148-149.

Mr. Carr also discusses a number of procedural reforms for congressional committees:

1. Wording "initial grants of authority much more precisely," so that the limits of the committee's area of exploration are more clearly defined.
2. "Important steps" should "be taken only by majority action." This is to eliminate "One-man hearings" and would also apply to fixing agenda, subpoenaing witnesses and publishing reports.
3. "Witnesses to have the right of" more effective "counsel" including counsel's limited right to cross-examine, raise objections and make statements.
4. Persons named before the committee to "enjoy a limited right of reply" to any "defamatory testimony."
5. Witnesses to be given "the right to make statements" particularly "a rebuttal statement" in order "to correct any misplaced emphasis. . .".
6. Witnesses to be given right "to testify in public hearings if he so requests," so there is less opportunity for "maltreatment of witnesses."
7. Witnesses to be given "the right to refuse to testify at a hearing that is being broadcast or televised."\(^{58}\)

Alan Barth endorses essentially the same reforms but would apparently allow a more free-running cross-examination.\(^{59}\)

In order to bring about some of these suggested reforms, Barth, Carr, and others have requested that Congress recognize and more effectively assert its responsibility for the actions of its committees. Erwin M. Griswold says:

Since the power exercised by a committee or a sub-committee, or a sub-committee of one, is the power of the House or Senate itself, responsibility for that power and its exercise rests not on the committee or the sub-committee of one or more, but

\(^{58}\)Ibid., pp. 49-52.

\(^{59}\)Barth, *When Congress Investigates*, pp. 26-27.
upon the House or Senate itself, acting, of course, by a majority vote of its members. One of the important steps which must be taken if we are to find a solution for problems in this area is, I believe, to focus attention on the fact that these hearings which are the occasion of concern are not merely private frolics of an individual member, but are an exercise of the power of a House of Congress for which every member of that House has a full and equal responsibility.\(^6\)

Many proposals regarding due process within the profession were put forward by representatives of the classical position during the McCarthy era and immediately thereafter. One rather well defined stand in opposition to the idea of automatic exclusion was developed by Ellsworth Barnard.

Against this view, a strong voice had already been raised in opposition—the voice of the American Association of University Professors; and against every pressure so far exerted, its oft-repeated resolution still stands: "The tests of the fitness of a member of the academic profession should be his professional competence, his integrity and character, and his ability and willingness to engage in vigorous, objective instruction and research; these to be measured by the accepted principles and standards of the profession. A teacher who is guilty of misusing his classes or his other relationships with his students for biased partisan propaganda, or is guilty of a legally defined subversive act, is responsible as an individual for the violation of professional principles or the law of the land, as the case may be and shall be dismissed, provided his guilt is established by evidence adduced in a proceeding in which he is given a full measure of due process."

... if the resolution is honestly read, it flatly challenges the assertion of the university presidents that "membership in the Communist Party extinguishes the right to a university position." It clearly implies that such membership is in itself

\(^6\)Griswold, op. cit., pp. 41-42.
not conclusive. It properly lays emphasis on overt acts and not on private opinions and associations.\(^{61}\)

The extent to which representatives of the classical position would support this particular statement is not known. A survey\(^{62}\) of over 2500 social science teachers, however, revealed that 45 per cent of them favored the retainment of admitted Communists as teachers.

In these difficult times, advocates of the classical position still maintain that testing ideas in the open market is the best way to sift truth from error. Freedom to seek and teach the truth in any scholarly manner is, from their point of view, essential not only to academic freedom but to a proper conception of the liberal society. The classicalists are fearful that American traditions of due process are being eroded by careless procedures of investigation and that congressional witch-hunts have created such public hysteria that the profession is in danger of being forced into a straitjacket of political orthodoxy by powerful right wing groups.

The classicalists feel that there is more than one way to fight communism. It may be engaged intelligently in an open field or dealt with in terms of closure. An open society, they would maintain, produces open minds--minds whihh

---

\(^{61}\)Barnard, *op. cit.*, pp. 318-319. (Italics mine.)

are in no sense inferior to those of the Communists. A militant orthodoxy on the other hand, would stifle creativity and fail to promote true loyalty or to ferret out dangerous disloyalty.
In reviewing the extended disagreement over communism and due process one is inclined to conclude that on this question (as with many others) the arguments depend at least as much upon tenacity as upon adherence to the rules of logic or evidence. It is not that either side is without evidence as it is that the weight of the evidence, which might permit warranted assertibility, has been so difficult to ascertain.

In addition to the problems growing out of incomplete evidence is the difficulty of meeting the issues squarely. The arguments of the classicists are frequently wide of Hook's points because they are primarily aimed at reactionaries and only incidentally at Hook. This is not always true, however, sometimes they just miss and Alexander Meiklejohn's argument about freeminded Communists is a case in point.

Meiklejohn, more by analogy than on the ground of evidence, argued that one was free to enter and leave the Communist Party as can be done with other parties and, that since this was so, the party member's beliefs were free. A more fruitful analogy from Hook's point of view might be that of a dope addict. Few are forced to take heroin and, also,
the addict may escape through a cure. But the individual is hardly "free" when the pupil of the eye is pin-point in size. Analogies aside, the point of Hook's argument is that whatever may occur within the recesses of one's mind no person is able steadfastly and publicly to oppose Party decisions while in the Party. Of course, one can drop out. This point is not at issue and, even if it was, it is not as easy as withdrawing from a missionary society.

Erwin Griswold's argument that use of the Fifth Amendment is not to be equated with an admission of criminal guilt is true as far as law is concerned. The issue, as noted in the previous chapter, is not one of legal guilt but of inferred but unproved moral guilt of sufficient important to merit further investigation. When Griswold's argument is used to imply that no inference of any kind may be drawn from the use of the Fifth Amendment, the point is pressed farther than Griswold would do. Discussing a case in which the witness might be cited for contempt for refusing to inform on friends after willingly testifying concerning his own past Griswold asks, "... would it not seem that such a person is at least in no worse a position morally than he was when he stood on the Fifth Amendment?"¹

On the other hand, Hook has just as surely not met Barth's criticism of the present loyalty and security program

with accuracy. While Barth needs to develop his program for a security program, it seems incorrect to assume that he has abandoned the whole concept.

Despite many areas of clear disagreement the positions of the professional competence and classical schools are in some respects not so disparate as they may seem to be at first glance. To begin with, they have a common concern for effective education and academic freedom. The issue arises over means, not ends, for the most part. In the second place, both positions are within the broad tradition of liberalism and stand in opposition to the conservative position of repression in education or, indeed, elsewhere. Each group opposes deliberate distortion and systematic propaganda in the classroom. Neither side wants to avoid or underplay the Communist issue and each would champion the use of original Communist documents in appropriate classes.

Hook's view of the nature of an academic community\(^2\) is in one essential respect similar to that of the classical position—namely, he holds that "it should be open to anyone to make a contribution," provided he plays "according to the rules." Again it is the "rules" or means not the stated end that is in dispute. To each side it appears certain that the means suggested by the opposition are bound to lead to some end other than the one agreed upon.

\(^2\)See Chapter III, pp.127.
A strong point of agreement is the emphasis placed on the need of professional autonomy in matters of institutional (rather than personal) investigation and, also, in the manner of establishing rules of professional competence and academic freedom and tenure. Both schools fear legislative intervention at the institutional and curricular level.

The key point of conflict arises between Hook's proposed categorical exclusion (except in rare cases where a Picasso might be involved) of individuals known to be Communists and the American Association of University Professors' apparent insistence that personal acts of classroom misconduct be proven in each case before dismissal may be considered. During the latter part of 1956 Hook and Ralph F. Fuchs wrote a series of articles in the New Leader which narrowed their differences to this issue. In the winter number of the 1956 A.A.U.P. Bulletin Fuchs and Hook issued a joint statement.

In his response to Professor Hook's article, the General Secretary of the Association stated that a Communist faculty member's commitment to dishonesty in performing his duties, such as will justify his dismissal, may be shown "by evidence that" the commitment "was consciously made, including evidence that it was acted upon and evidence that a denial of it is not made in good faith." By itself, this statement may be taken to mean that evidence of actual dishonest acts, pursuant to the commitment, is essential to sustain a dismissal; but the meaning intended was that such evidence is one of the kinds of evidence that may suffice to establish a commitment and sustain a dismissal. That this was the intended meaning appears from the statement in the preceding paragraph that "the AAUP has never maintained, and its Committee does not now assert,
that a commitment by a faculty member to use deception or concealment, whether the commitment is made through acceptance of organizational policies or otherwise, must be followed by actual misbehavior before his dismissal can be justified. Such a commitment is clearly inconsistent with professional objectivity and integrity. . . ." This point is not explicitly made in the report of the Association's Special Committee; but it is stated in Part B of the Committee's report that "The academic profession has a duty to defend society and itself from subversion of the educational process by dishonest tactics, including political conspiracies to deceive students and lead them unwittingly into acceptance of dogmas or false causes." Conspiracy thus stands condemned; and conspiracy is completed by agreement, whether or not it leads to further misconduct. There is thus no conflict between the view of Professor Hook and that of the Association as interpreted, concerning condemnation of a proved commitment to practice deceit.

In Professor Hook's comment the statement is made that membership of a faculty member in a group which, like the Communist Party, has issued instructions to practice deceit in a teaching position, "although this should not be an automatic ground for dismissal, . . . should constitute a presumption of unfitness." The conclusion of unfitness, Professor Hook makes clear in his rejoinder, can be established only by a proceeding in which the faculty member's colleagues carry out their responsibility to judge him, after opportunity for a hearing. Hence, under Professor Hook's view as well as that of the Association, conscientious involvement in a conspiracy against the integrity of the educational process disqualifies the faculty member, membership in the Communist Party gives ground for inquiry, and the inquiry should be attended by academic due process. A difference as to burden of proof may inhere in the two positions, but it is not likely to assume practical significance.3

One must really ask why Mr. Fuchs has had such difficulty in making himself understood in the past? If one need not have performed an "actual dishonest act," but only to

---

"commit" or pledge oneself to do so, why did he not clarify the issue earlier? As he says "this point is not explicitly made in the report of the Association's Special Committee; . . ." The concluding portion of this sentence leads us back into one of those pious and (when unexplained) vague exhortations used all too frequently in statements about this subject.

Mr. Fuchs, in the "Joint Statement," seems to have taken a position somewhat different from the one frequently understood to be that of the A.A.U.P. and its former General Secretary. It may be that this view has always been the one held but, if so, this has not been obvious. Mr. Hook, on the other hand, has clearly given up his conception of the categorical and automatic exclusion of the teacher who is found to be a Communist. It is perhaps not irrelevant, however, that Hook's concession was made in late 1956 rather than in 1953 or 1954.

The "Joint Statement" leaves us up in the air as to what other "kinds of evidence" (than overt acts) "may suffice to establish a commitment and sustain a dismissal." On what kinds of evidence do the authors agree? How could a faculty committee obtain it? Such a commitment is not likely to be made before a convocation of the faculty.

The "Joint Statement" does not resolve all the differences which exist between the two schools of thought, a point which is readily admitted by its authors. It does, however,
resolve the chief "bone of contention" by insisting on individual examination of cases and by suggesting the operation of the "bad tendency" principle within the profession when mere commitment to conceal or distort is proven. In the relative calm which now prevails it may be that the operating principles suggested in the "Joint Statement" can be worked out in varying ways by interested professional groups according to local conditions and needs.

One question still unresolved, and which may receive differing answers when faced in the light of local conditions, is whether the threat of Communist subversion or right wing repression poses a greater threat to educational freedom. Those who argue that the Communist movement is the real danger may point to (1) proven transmission of vital scientific information to the Communists, (2) the decline of McCarthyism, (3) Russian aggression in Hungary, (4) recent Communist economic and ideological advances among the underdeveloped nations, (5) the Sputniks and Sputnik diplomacy, and (6) evidence that "naive liberalism" is in some respects still naive.

Those who feel that right wing repression is still the greater danger may argue that (1) repression produced an exodus of creative personnel from many vital fields and caused our scientific lag, (2) the repressive atmosphere stifled intelligent discussion of international policy and is responsible for our failure here, (3) McCarthyism has only withdrawn to local strongholds and stands ready to reappear.
as soon as issues on the local front create "troubled waters," (4) repressionists are well financed and represent influential groups, and (5) there has been no sign of real reform in the area of Congressional investigations. Merely to list these aspects of the problem indicates its complexity and demonstrates why an unqualified answer is difficult, if not impossible.

It must be pointed out that Congressional investigations and historic events have each thrown more light on the conspiratorial nature of the Communist movement. Whatever may have happened in the past, it seems hardly probable that one might today enter a Communist organization and remain within it for years without becoming aware that it is something more than a club of birdwatchers. Yet naive liberalism and popular-front psychology still exist and because they do the problem persists. What does one do about suspected Communist factions who join to "help out in a good cause?" John Dewey once observed:

I do not think Communists should be permitted to teach. I know from personal experience how difficult it is to conduct a teacher's group if you have to deal with Communists. But in getting rid of Communists we must not destroy the morale of the teaching profession.4

Today Russian education is alternately overrated, as when alarmists imply we must now "rebuild our entire educational system" and place science on a "crash program"; or

---

underrated, as when it is assumed that all Russian achieve-
ments are the result of "stolen secrets and captive German
scientists." The confusion is, of course, confounded when
politically liberal newsmen, whose lay views on education
incline them to a traditional position naively suggest that
the 1929 Stalinization of the Russian educational system was
"a return to good sense" and who when asked about the "adult
sobriety" of the students in that system answer to the effect
that it is "the student's interest in new knowledge."5

While few would today deny that the Communist conspir-
acy poses a serious and continuing threat to the nation there
seems little awareness or concern over the fact that Congres-
sional committees are still engaging in highly questionable
investigating procedures. The censuring of McCarthy did not
constitute reform. Perhaps we should note that legislative
repression of thought is today more apt to occur at the
state level, where local or regional issues, such as redis-
tricting, vice, right-to-work laws, or the desegregation of
public schools may trigger procedural myopia. Naturally,
these issues are often traced by reactionaries to radical
influences in the college.

5Lecture by Harrison Salisbury, Ohio State University,
June 31, 1958. (My italics.) In Mr. Salisbury's defense it
must be noted that the lecture was purposely delivered at the
"popular level" and that his observations regarding student
interest occurred during a question and answer period.
Another question that will probably need to be explored at the local level concerns the nature and extent of Communist Party discipline. Hook has contended that discipline is total, that it reaches every member, and that teachers are instructed systematically to distort issues and facts in favor of the Party line. Supporting this view, J. Edgar Hoover indicates that a constant round of Communist Party activities—fund drives, discussion groups, passing out leaflets, speeches, lectures, writing articles, etc.—robs members of the time necessary to think about other things and the deeper implications of their own activity.

The member is always on the run, doing this and doing that. He has no spare time, energy or money for himself. His whole life becomes dominated. The Party is his school, source of friends, and recreation, his substitute for God. Communism wants the total man, hence it is totalitarian. That is part of its indoctrination policy: by concentrating everything on the Party, all other interests are squeezed out.°

This monopolization of the entire social life of the member can become a disciplinary mechanism in another way, too. If one develops a deviationist tendency, he is dropped—and he is then alone. Hoover says:

An expellee must have no association with any member of the Party—even though that member be his own father, mother, wife, or husband. "Associating with the enemy" is the usual charge. This means the splitting of families, the tearing apart of friends. In one instance, a woman member was

---

expelled. Her husband was instructed to leave her and the children. When he refused, he was expelled. Another member who remained friendly was also ousted. It becomes a dizzy mery-go-round of personal spleen. 7

According to Herbert Brownell the party has been known to use coercive measures in forcing individuals into its service. He says "... they use persons who are subject to blackmail because of personal habits that they do not want to have exposed to public view." 8 Hoover also indicates the use of ruthless measures by the Party against its members. He relates the story of John Lautner a member of twenty years standing.

One day in January, 1950, he was told to proceed to Cleveland, Ohio, to help in perfecting plans for the communist underground in Ohio. Upon arrival he was taken ostensibly to a Party meeting in the basement of a residence. There he was ordered to remove his clothes and for a period of several hours was subjected to the basest of indignities. He was told that he would not leave alive as six other communists, who Lautner said had "butcher knives,""revolvers," "rubber hoses," and a "recording machine," started questioning him about his knowledge of the underground, his army record, his relationship with Hungarian defectees, and his reports to federal agencies. He was accused of being an enemy agent, a spy, of hiring unreliable people to work in the Communist Party defense office, and protecting government "spies" in the Party. Actually, Lautner was innocent of these charges, and the Party's injustice inured to the government's benefit. Finally Lautner had the presence of mind to state that he had left at his hotel the name of one of the communist officials conducting the star-chamber proceedings. He was released and returned to New York,

7 Ibid., p. 186.

where he read in the *Daily Worker* that he had been expelled from the Party as an enemy agent.9

At a hearing of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives Bella Dodd was asked to describe what might happen if a teacher tried to deviate from the Party Line.

**Dr. Dodd.** First, they would try to cajole and convince her that she was wrong.

**Mr. Kunzig.** Who would try?

**Dr. Dodd.** The other party members in the union and the leader of the union, and if she still persisted they would probably bring in the county leader of the Communist Party to talk with her.

**But** if she persisted in it, the next thing would be to expose her and expel her from the party. Sometimes that expulsion is very violent. Sometimes it isn't. The more important the teacher the more violent the expulsion. They wouldn't worry about whether she lost her job or reputation and wouldn't worry about charges. I have seen charges discussed against people which were just brutal.

**Mr. Kunzig.** You mean discussed by members of the Communist Party?

**Dr. Dodd.** Discussed by the control commission, the disciplinary commission.

**Mr. Kunzig.** Do you know whether the Communist Party has its own security system, its own detectives, its own shall we say spy apparatus to see that Communist members in key positions are not double-crossing the party?

**Dr. Dodd.** The party functions with its own security apparatus at all levels, practically.10

At another point Dr. Dodd described how Party decisions influenced classroom teaching methods and other professional activities.

**Dr. Dodd.** . . . As a teacher in my classroom, let us suppose the question is the admission

---


of Red China into the United Nations. I have a bulletin board with clippings and I begin putting clippings on the bulletin board which are pro and if I put some against, I put more of those that are pro.

The children raise the question and I discuss it with them back and forth and with a show of impartiality and I weight the thing in favor of the line which I want adopted.

If I am teaching history it becomes logical. I take a question such as "When do we recognize a country which has changed its form of government?" I show that there has been a legitimate effort after a certain period of time to recognize a de facto government. In other words, I show that as a normal course of relationships on international problems that we would recognize a country of that kind.

In other words, I try to make it as natural as possible for the students to accept the line I am promulgating, but I know what I am doing is promoting the ideas which I have.

As I said before, we teach children and not subject matter. You not only see a child in the classroom in which you teach, you see him in your off class period and in his group relationships.

The best Communist teacher I know was a mathematics teacher because the social studies heads weeded out the Communists. The mathematics teachers are not expected to have those opinions. They served on committees to select textbooks, for establishing curricula, for mass participation of the students in civic affairs.11

As indicated in chapter IV the respondents in the University of Washington case testified "that they had never been subjected to discipline, that they felt free to do their own thinking and reach their own conclusions." They also claimed to have remained in the Party "through personal conviction and not from fear of persecution." The last statement may indicate that the respondents were just good

11 Ibid., p. 2902.
Communists who never needed discipline. The minority report presented in their defense indicates, however, that testimony and documents imply that discipline is not applied to the "rank-and-file."

Respondents introduced expert testimony and documentary material tending to show that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is not foreign dominated, does not advocate illegal means to achieve its ultimate goal of establishing socialism, does not attempt to discipline its rank-and-file members or insist upon their unquestioning adherence to the party line, and is a lawful political party. Respondents testified that each joined the Communist Party in 1935 and has continued such membership since. That their Party activities were and are almost entirely confined to paying dues and attending discussion meetings of their unit, that they believe the Party to be a legitimate political party of the nature described by their general evidence, and that they have not surrendered their intellectual independence and freedom of belief.12

To decide on the quality of the "expert testimony and documentary material" one would have to hear and see it. The vague nature of some of the more recent constitutions of the Party was discussed in Chapter III. Perhaps it was from such sources that the material was drawn.

Of course, one is always allowed to question the Party line but he cannot publicly oppose the Party line. If he continues to "question," he will in all probability work his way up through various "review commissions" until the party

line changes to his views or he is disciplined or possibly expelled.\(^{13}\) As to whether or not discipline is enforced on the rank-and-file membership the 1945 Party constitution says:

Section 1. The highest authority of the Party is the National Convention. Regular National Conventions shall be held every two years. The National Conventions are authorized to make political and organizational decisions binding upon the entire Party and its membership except as provided in Article VII, Section 6.\(^{14}\)

Article VII, Section 6 provides that "between National Conventions" the National Committee shall enforce and execute all policies adopted at the convention. What actual practices may be in operation with regard to enforcement within the party are not readily verified; but the constitution makes it clear that all members are supposed to be under whatever discipline the National Convention authorizes.

Whatever one may feel about the views of Mr. Hook, Mr. Hoover, Mr. Brownell, and Miss Dodd, it is well to weigh the claims of admitted or proven Party members against the background of the Communist view that "the ends justify the means." It does not seem rash to suggest the possibility that a Communist might perjure himself.

Another unsettled question which the profession may wish to discuss further is the credo adopted by the New School


\(^{14}\)Ibid., p. 125.
for Social Research and recommended by Hook. This point of view, which was developed in Chapter III, provided for the exclusion of all teachers who were members of political groups that attempted to dictate in matters of science. A credo of some form is perhaps desirable but, as was noted in Chapter I, there are some who have reservations about the emphasis already placed on science and scientific method in our schools. The report of the Harvard Committee on General Education in a Free Society had asked if the "scientific attitude" was in truth "applicable to the full horizon of life. . . ."

Bernard Meland criticized both the rationalistic views of Hutchins and the scientific method of Dewey as being neglectful of man's "spiritual dimensions." Even so staunch a friend of rational and scientific methods as David Spitz says:

But this emphasis on method or process—which is of course the very essence of the democratic principle, and which in turn compels acceptance of the principle of free inquiry--itself requires vindication, both on intrinsic and on instrumental grounds. For a method is not only a means to a certain end; it is always a partial realization of that end itself, what John Dewey would call an end-in-view. It is, so to say, both a value and a means to the attainment of other values.15

There may be many faculties that are now ready and willing to accept the New School's formulation, with its

emphasis on science, but the foregoing arguments would seem to preclude its universal acceptance. Perhaps acceptance of the loose phrasing, "methods-of-the-scholar," is the most one can hope for on this question. One must also face the argument that all such formulations are meaningless and in practice constitute no more than an invitation to the hypocrite to engage in deceit.

**Possible Next Steps**

It is obvious that the profession cannot handle the problem of concealed Communists solely on its own. Colleges do not have the facilities necessary to conduct an extensive screening of personnel and, moreover, they are understandably reluctant to do so in the first place. The first hint of many a secretly "colonized" Communist has turned up thousands of miles from the point of his concealment.

While the profession may correctly request the right to withhold judgment and make its own decisions in such cases, and may urge the investigation be limited to specifically suspected persons, rather than be expanded to the institution itself, there hardly seems reason to believe that all forms of cooperation with investigating committees of the Congress are to be frowned upon. If a properly authorized investigating committee or commission has **substantial derogatory information** concerning a faculty member, the proper professional authorities need to be informed, even if the government investigators do not care to explore the
case any further. This is so not only because of possible espionage activities but because the profession needs to establish by a proper investigation of its own whether or not there has been a breach of professional ethics.

On what grounds does Congress investigate? This is a question too infrequently raised. Robert K. Carr says,

It is now generally recognized that there are three valid reasons for the exercise of the investigating power by Congress. The first of these is its use as a means of obtaining information which is needed in connection with the enactment of statutes, the confirmation of appointments or ratification of treaties by the Senate, the expulsion of a member by either house, or the exercise of other express congressional powers.16

Supporting this view in the case of *McGrain vs. Daugherty*

Justice Van Devanter said:

We are of opinion that the power of inquiry—with process to enforce it—is an essential and appropriate auxiliary to the legislative function. . . .

A legislative body cannot legislate wisely or effectively in the absence of information respecting the conditions which the legislation is intended to affect or change; and where the legislative body does not itself possess the requisite information—which not infrequently is true—recourse must be had to others who do possess it. Experience has taught that mere requests for such information often are unavailing and also that information which is volunteered is not always accurate or complete; so some means of compulsion are essential to obtain what is needed.17

Carr goes on to state:

The second purpose that has figured prominently in many congressional investigations is checking

---

17 Ibid., p. 20.
the executive branch in order to determine whether administrative machinery is adequate for law-enforcement purposes or executive officers are carrying out policy in the way in which Congress intended it should be. Congress has been particularly prone to scrutinize the work of administrative agencies for signs of corruption or to determine whether appropriations are being properly expended. . . .

The Supreme Court has never expressly approved this second purpose of investigations, but its approval is implicit in many of its opinions. Virtually the entire machinery of the executive branch has been created by acts of Congress and is subject at any time to reorganization by Congress. Similarly, the duties of these executive agencies are in large measure prescribed by acts of Congress.18

Carr continues:

The third purpose that has often been present in investigations is a desire to influence public opinion by giving wide circulation to certain facts or ideas.

Ordinarily a controversial law on an important subject cannot be enacted in the absence of a favorable climate of public opinion. If Congress possesses information that leads it to believe that such a law is needed, does it not have the right, indeed even the duty to make this information known to the people, too?19

Woodrow Wilson called attention to the "instruction and guidance" people might receive when national concerns are examined in "broad daylight." It was his conclusion that:

. . . unless Congress both scrutinize these things and sift them by every form of discussion, the country must remain in embarrassing, crippling ignorance of the very affairs which it is most

---

18 Ibid., pp. 20-21.
19 Ibid., pp. 21-22.
important that it should understand and direct. The informing function of Congress should be preferred even to its legislative function.\(^\text{20}\)

That the "informing function" is frequently abused for personal glory and partisan advantage is all too obvious; but, as Carr implies, the "possible abuse of power" is hardly "a sufficient argument" against its existence. Although reforms are in order it is doubtful that Congress should assume the responsibility of enacting legislation on the ground that it is based on information of which the public is unaware. Such a view carries within it a greater potential threat to individual liberty than is likely to occur from an abuse of the informing function.

Informing is one thing and creating panic, in both liberal and conservative circles because of Congressional excesses, is another. It might be wise for Congress to make more use of mixed civilian and government commissions, such as the Hoover Commission when its investigations touch on ideological and partisan ends and methods. The potential helpfulness of a Permanent Investigating Committee, based on the idea of the British Royal Commission of Inquiry and suggested by Carr, was discussed in the last chapter. This idea has considerable merit. Since the personnel of such a committee would seldom include Congressmen, the tendency to use it for partisan purposes would be greatly reduced.

Procedural reforms, such as a clear statement of charges, the right to confront one's accusers and to cross-examine on a limited basis, the right to effective counsel, and the right to make rebuttal statements were discussed in the last chapter, also. These weaknesses in procedure, and the corrective suggestions offered for them, are so generally known, and their continued abuse so apparent, that there can be little excuse for continued lethargy on the part of Congress. If the corrective measures enacted do not work as expected, they can always be changed.

It may well be that Barth's suggestion of separating the investigation of espionage from the policing function of the FBI by establishing a highly secret counterespionage agency has merit. This kind of program, however, would hardly seem to eliminate the secret files that disturbed him. The relative merits of files, of no files, or of some files involves a number of questions which free citizens need to ponder.

As far as the profession is concerned it would seem that some security measures must be taken on those campuses where secret research is carried on. Undoubtedly, all personnel directly connected with specific research projects need to be investigated before being given security clearance; but much further the investigations should go is open for debate. The controversial section 6-1 of the Industrial Security Manual (discussed in chapter IV) seems to allow the
project's security officers a rather wide latitude based on "possible compromise of classified information." At the very least a faculty member should be informed when his dossier is turned over for investigation.

Regardless of how one may feel about it as a permanent arrangement, coexistence with the Communists promises to be a fact of life in the foreseeable future. This means that the threat of conspiracy and secret "colonization" will also continue. While there is probably not much danger from these actions now, and little reason to think they will be allowed to increase, some attempts at subversion will certainly be made. It may be wise, therefore, in this period of relative calm, for members of the profession to discuss all aspects of the problem as these relate, first, to their own institutions and situations and, second, to the educational and cultural picture as a whole.

If another international crisis such as Korea occurs and a procedurally unreformed Congress again begins to flail about for subversives on the campus what should be done? In the first place, all citizens have a moral and legal obligation to testify unless things have reached such state of widespread corruption and cruelty on the part of government officials that one may feel justified in civil disobedience. Anyone who has facts or information which may help Congress in the formation of intelligent legislation has a moral duty
to give it when asked. Congress may cite him for contempt if he does not.

In addition to his responsibilities as a citizen, a member of the profession has an added obligation to the institution in which he is employed. H. Gordon Hullfish has said:

... it is best to meet committee questioning frankly and openly. When witnesses seem to lack candor, suspicion arises, warranted or not. The public may not understand the subtleties of debate, but it does understand frankness. Moreover, candor on the part of the witness may be expected to have important consequences for the character of the investigations; at least, it will be meaningful for a public now confused.

There is yet another side of the matter. The citizen called before a committee is asked to take part in government itself. He should do so freely. Nor should the citizen, when a scholar, find it difficult to cooperate in a search for fact. It may turn out that the individual feels warranted in claiming the privilege of refusing to answer; yet such a claim may be misinterpreted by the public and lead to disturbing consequences, both for him and for his institution. No claim should be made, therefore, except as it is prompted by the considered judgment of counsel.21

In the event of an investigation of one's colleagues are there any principles which may serve as guides to protect both the institution and the individual? If so, to what extent will they satisfy the opposing views of Hook and Fuchs in light of their Joint Statement? The profession might very well strive at this time to create the condition necessary to restore confidence, unity, and due process so

that future investigations, if such arise, may be met with
greater equanimity. Hullfish has suggested five guides for
faculty action when one of its members is under interrogation.

1. No teacher or staff member should be suspected
simply because he is subpoenaed by a committee. This
will be a moment of concern for all involved but the
individual should know that the chief concern of his
institution, of his colleagues, will be to make cer-
tain that his case is not prejudged.

2. Each institution, within the limits of its
faculty specialization, or in cooperation with its
alumni and friends, should provide the individual
with the opportunity to gain a fair view of his
legal status when he is before a committee. Most
teachers lack the knowledge here which the special-
ist could readily supply. Here, indeed, is a service
area which the American Civil Liberties Union,
through its Academic Freedom Committee, is exploring.
Not all institutions have legal talent incorporated
within faculties.

3. No teacher or staff member should be summarily
dismissed, or suspended, because of what he says
before a committee or because of his refusal to say
anything. Right here is the critical point at issue
at the moment. Policy is now being formed by the
actions of boards and administrators, frequently
unsupported by any fact they have themselves
established.

4. In each institution, once a problem arises as
a result of one of its faculty or staff members being
called before a legislative committee, a committee of
the faculty should conduct an investigation, if an
investigation appears to be warranted. This com-
mittee should be expected to bring forward the deci-
sion on which the institution will take its stand.
In the event that the president or the board, or
these together, should find differently than the
committee, the problem should be reviewed, with all
of the arguments made available to the faculty for
study. This practice should be followed, in order
to achieve procedures appropriate to the educational
situation.

5. Each institution, where legally possible,
should reserve to itself the right to decide what
manner of person it will employ, the conditions
under which this will be done, and the conditions
under which a severance of relationships will take
place. It dare not delegate this responsibility to
committees that are external to its purposes, duly constituted though they may be. Some institutions may conclude that the identification of one of its members with the Communist Party, in the present or in the past, is a reason for dismissal that is not debatable. Others may not. On this point educators entertain as many differing opinions as do citizens generally.22

The individual, under a program of this sort, would receive a full measure of due process. While an automatic hearing by one's colleagues would not result because a faculty member was called as a witness in an official investigation, ill-advised action, before a committee, would. The use of the Fifth Amendment in response to questions related to membership in the Communist Party would fall in this category. In a report entitled "Academic Freedom and Tenure in the Quest for National Security" a special committee of the A.A.U.P. states:

The administrations of colleges and universities should, of course, take note of indications of the possible unfitness of faculty members. If a faculty member invokes the Fifth Amendment when questioned about Communism, or if there are other indications of past or present Communist associations or activities, his institution cannot ignore the possible significance for itself of these matters. There is then a possibility of his involvement in activities subversive of education itself, or otherwise indicative, to an important degree, of his unfitness to teach. As in other instances of possible unfitness, preliminary inquiry into this possibility is warranted and can become a duty.23

---

22 Ibid., pp. 20-21.

A rule for the automatic exclusion of proven communists need not lead to an expanding flood of repression. This "breach-in-the-dam" argument was discussed earlier and is more a descriptive art-form than a statement of facts. All is not necessarily lost because of a momentary breach—as the pearl oyster mutely testifies.

The danger of unbending loyalty to a single principle is that this action (just as often as the "breach") may place other ends in jeopardy. Extremists on each side of the race question today can lead us to a situation of internal chaos and international disrepute. Frequently, those who use the breach argument do not believe it themselves. Note how quickly some who have used it in defense of free speech will point to the fallacy when some bigot argues "that one Negro in our white schools will lead to the eventual mongrelization of the race."

The argument against allowing any breach may also lead one towards a popular front point of view in which it is argued that the attack on communists is just another form of "vicious anti-intellectualism." The "ritualistic liberal" is not inclined to charge the peasants of the Reformation with anti-intellectualism because they shouted "hokus pokus" at their former clerical masters. Intelligence has often indicated that persons suffering "tubular vision" as a result of narrow interests or of prolonged research on pet hypotheses, may run out on an intellectual limb. It is not vicious anti-
intellectualism when someone cuts the limb from beneath them, nor is the whole tree necessarily lost.

This is not to say that adherents of the classical position are wrong about the importance of maintaining their interpretation of academic freedom. It may well be that this is the keystone of liberty. The relevance of the argument against allowing any breach to occur depends upon conditions— including other values at stake in any given situation. The conditional nature of the argument's relevance becomes obvious when we ask; Will one drink lead to alcoholism, one indiscretion to a life of sin, or one jump off the cliff to death.

The point of the whole matter is that under certain prevailing conditions, and in light of numerous values involved, a faculty may properly decide that loyalty to a party pledged to distort issue and fact, proven under conditions of due process, is a sufficient cause for dismissal. On the other hand, a different faculty may decide that the Communists do not fit this description or should be allowed

---

The Supreme Court in the case of *Slochower v. Board of Higher Education* (April, 1956) handed down a five-to-four decision outlawing automatic discharge in Fifth Amendment cases. This decision does not apply to the example under discussion because the example assumes a hearing in which due process occurs and because it involves proven loyal membership in a party known to require distortion and not just a Fifth Amendment pleading. Dismissal automatically follows proof of such membership, without examining personal acts of classroom misconduct.
to teach even if they do. The intellectually free Republican
Robert A. Taft once said:

As a member of the board of trustees of a university
I would not favor firing anyone for being a Com­
munist unless I was certain that he was teaching
Communism and having some effect on the development
of the thought of the students.25

Taft's qualification, interestingly, would not even preclude
the teaching of Marxism by a Communist but hinges on the
effectiveness with which it was done. One need not agree
with Mr. Taft's position; it may be argued that the effec­
tiveness of the Communist teacher is a risk we will have to
take in the open market.

Would such a program be contrary to the Smith Act? In
June of the 1956-1957 term the Supreme Court upset the con­
viction of fourteen California Communists. A report by the
Commission on Law and Social Action of the American Jewish
Congress states:

On the "advocacy" charge, the Court held that
the Smith Act did not prohibit advocacy and teach­
ing of forcible overthrow of government as an
abstract principle. The Smith Act, the Court said,
"was aimed at the advocacy and teaching of concrete
action for the forcible overthrow of the government,
and not of principles divorced from action." The
Court did not disturb its earlier holding in the
Dennis case that "advocacy of violent action to be
taken at some future time was enough." However,
it emphasized that there must be advocacy of action.
The District Court's mistake, it held, was in tell­
ing the jury that "mere doctrinal justification of

25 Dwight L. Bolinger, "Who Is Intellectually Free?"
forcible overthrow, if engaged in with intent to accomplish overthrow, is punishable \textit{per se} under the Smith Act."\textsuperscript{26}

Whether a Communist teacher would accept a job and abide by the rules laid down in this decision is open to question. It is obvious, nevertheless, that the opportunity for employment is legally permissible.

While having Communists on the faculty may be \textit{legal}—whether it is morally, professionally, or pragmatically justified depends on other factors. The position of many in the classical school, including Barth, has been that while no one advocated "hiring" communists, their exclusion after many years of service during which they reveal no acts of professional misconduct was unjustified. The fact that one has committed no acts may, in the case of Communists, reveal no more than clever concealment and colonization.

In most cases today if a Communist is discovered on the faculty he will have signed a loyalty oath disclaiming his membership. In such cases, a moral question is surely raised. What may be more often found is that a suspected Communist will have dropped his membership shortly before signing an oath and probably for no other purpose than to meet the legal requirements. In either case a faculty

\textsuperscript{26}"Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Decision of the United States Supreme Court for the 1956-1957 Term" (Commission on Law and Social Action of the American Jewish Congress, New York, July, 1957), p. 9. (Mimeographed.)
investigating committee will want to ask some serious ques-
tions before endorsing such a person for continued employment.

Instead of trying to make a case for those who have
resorted to concealment, it would appear to be far wiser,
and more in line with the purposes they intend to support,
for the adherents of the classical position to advocate the
hiring of known or avowed Communists who meet other profes-
sional requirements and openly apply for a job. The moral
case against the admitted Communist is surely no worse than
it is against those who have resorted to secret colonization.
And one may rightly ask what danger of effective distortion
of facts will stem from the known Communist. Is it not
their secrecy which makes them dangerous? To assume that
known Communists will effect any extensive disenchantment on
the part of American students is an insult to the intelligence
of the students and to that of the overwhelming number of
alert non-communist members of the teaching profession.

It may be argued that from the point of view of
American parents and taxpayers any disenchantment is too
much. When one considers the goals of the Party, its methods
of discipline, its use as a recruiting mechanism for Soviet
espionage and the ruined lives and opportunities which result
from association with it in our culture, this argument is not
one to be tossed lightly aside with some reference to Mill
or Jefferson.

Somewhat related to this problem are certain inter-
national aspects of the Communist threat. Many foreign
students attend American colleges and universities today.

M. Brewster Smith has pointed out that cross-cultural contacts do not always "lead to greater understanding," or to good will, even if understanding is achieved. He says that we are more and more asking as we consider student exchange:

> Will his experience unfit him for a constructive role in his less-advantaged homeland? And perhaps most insistently, will his voice be heard as a friend of America in the forum of world ideological conflict? Sometimes, indeed, the question reduces to a plaintive, will he love us?27

Dealing with the same problem Theodore Hsi-en Chen says:

> Many a foreign student returns to his native land discouraged, and even bitter, over unfortunate experiences in the United States. Some of these students, . . . have encountered difficulties in their out-of-school contacts: with immigration authorities, with landlords, in connection with rooming and housing arrangements, in incidents reflecting lack of consideration for foreigners or prejudices of one kind or another. Such unpleasant experiences often leave ugly scars in the memory of the foreign students and at times color their entire thinking in regard to the United States.28

And in an alarming article Walter Eells quotes a statement by Allan Bromley, a British education officer in Kenya.

> Some of our Kenya young men have been sent to England for advanced study. But they have been lonely in London—and London can be the loneliest city in the world for a stranger from the colonies,


particularly if he has a dark-colored skin and is of a hesitant or retiring nature. Communist agents in London, however, are on the lookout for just such young men. They are very friendly. They invite them to tea and to evenings of discussion. The lonely students respond quickly to such warm and friendly advances to strangers in a strange country—and before long they are well on their way to becoming full-fledged Communist agents. Several of our young men have already returned to Kenya after such experiences in London and are stirring up trouble here today.29

The situation on most American campuses may not present any danger such as is described here and, of course, one may with perfect logic argue that the correct answer to the problem, where it exists, is to have Americans live up to their ideals. A perfect syllogism is, however, rather difficult to impose rapidly on some aspects of American life and, in the meantime (unless the student exchange program is handled with care), incalculable harm may be done. No value, however satisfying, can be evaluated apart from other values. We want to encourage freedom and we want a world at peace. Under present world conditions the incorrect pursuit of either could lead to the exclusion of the other or the elimination of both. None of this implies the cessation of the student exchange program. The consequences of such an action now could be far worse than any misunderstandings which may develop as a result of exchange. What may be

needed is discretion in the execution of the program until members of differing cultures come to understand each other better.

Another aspect which certainly should be considered before deciding to permit Communists on the faculty is whether or not we are engaged in a war with any Communist nation at the time. Public opinion, boards of control, and state legislatures have a right to be heard in such situations and one need not doubt they will be. War or not, if secret research or advanced military work are engaged in on the campus, it is clear under section 6-1 of the Industrial Security Manual that all campus personnel may be secretly investigated if security officers feel this to be necessary.

Of course, one counter measure to many of the dangers discussed, as Hook has pointed out, would be a required course on "Communism in Theory and Practice," effectively and honestly taught by non-communist members on a faculty.

Theories about academic freedom and what to do about Communists on faculties are many; and the evidence with regard to them is incomplete. The weight to be given to the facts that are known should be determined, when possible, by persons and factors on the campus where the issue arises. If, after an analysis of the dangers indicated in this dissertation, and any others which may have bearing, a faculty decides in favor of the bad tendency principle, the judgment of others of the rightness of the decision ought to focus on
the presence or absence of the full protection of the individual by due process. If under differing conditions, it is the considered opinion of others that Communists should remain on the faculty until overt acts of classroom misconduct are committed or a clear and present danger of espionage or sabotage exists, judgment ought to be withheld until the consequences of the decision can be examined.

No one knows whether the remaining differences between the classical and professional competence positions can be resolved but it would seem that the "Joint Statement" has opened a door to the possible creation of due process on the campus. Due process in education, as elsewhere, is deeply rooted in the Western tradition. It expresses a concern for the rights of the individual and, whenever possible, tends to favor the individual over the collective power of the state. In education, one aspect of this tradition demands that each student shall have the kind of educational experience which frees him from uncriticized adjustment to the patterns of his own culture. No educational program which fails to give the student "a better go at life," in this respect, is justified.

Equally, in education the tradition of due process demands a full and fair hearing for the individual teacher whenever there is any doubt as to his fitness whether this doubt arises over the suspicion of subversion on his part or over a question of incompetence. The arbitrary and categorical treatment of individual problems is a process which,
however well defined, is inclined to lead to collective inhumanity. Thus, due process is the necessary means for the advancement of justifiable and humane ends in a free man's education.

There is a better chance now, for all to deliberate on the nature of both the means and the ends. It is surely obvious that not all has been lost. T. V. Smith pointed out several years ago that this would be the case.

It is a balance of forces, a moving and operative equilibrium, which liberty requires.

There are citizens today (and many American well-wishers abroad) who think that we are in dire danger of losing our liberties through hysteria. They seem to forget that demagogues have passed this way before, indeed in every previous decade, trooping through their own noise to oblivion. They say that we are fighting communism by methods that either are, or will become, subversive of our ancient heritage. Others estimate the external threat (already internalized they say) to be so clear and present that no methods will do save to fight fire with fire.

Meantime, between this hysteria and that counter-hysteria, the great body of our citizenry stands, not unbaffled but definitely uncowed. Their trust is not in parchment but is in what our imperishable parchment proclaims: liberty absolute for all thought, liberty limited formation, liberty as large as is humanly possible for speech. Not the Nay of fear but the Everlasting Yea of hope: this is clearly the accent of America. This is the calm voice lifted above troubled waters.29
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