

## C H A P T E R I X

A TIDE OF FEAR has swept Washington and is undermining the freedom of the nation. We cannot turn that tide just by vindicating each individual who has been falsely accused; we must re-establish the freedom to inquire and the freedom to express opinions based on independent inquiry. These two freedoms are the flesh and the spirit of our political and intellectual freedom. Unless they are recognized by more than lip service; unless we can actually enjoy them in practice, the rights of the citizen are doomed.

We have gone through shattering disillusionments since the end of the war and in them is the root of the evils that now haunt us. The fight to save the world from being enslaved by fascism and militarism was won by a Grand Alliance of very different peoples and states and we thought of all our allies as being on the democratic side. We all called each other democratic. The United Nations was founded on the hope that there could be a peacetime association between peoples who had many conflicting interests, but certain fundamental interests in common. We hoped to win the peace by finding ways to reconcile the still remaining conflicts of interest among the peoples of a liberated world.

The disintegration of this wartime Grand Alliance now

threatens to destroy the United Nations and the peace of the world. A great hope has been deferred, and our hearts have been made sick. Fear and suspicion now run wild in our country.

The witch-hunting of which McCarthy is a part is recruited from ex-Communists and pro-Fascists, American Firsters, anti-Semites, Coughlinites, and similar fringe fanatics of the political underworld. It was groups like these that Hitler used to run interference for him, causing the confusion and dismay that he and his real backers, the big-time reactionaries, needed in order to take over the state. But these vanguards of fascism cannot be dismissed as lunatics. Their purposes are diverse, but all of them lead up to the training and indoctrination of strongarm groups. In the meantime they flourish on dissension, turmoil, and notoriety. To keep themselves in the news and to promote the sale of their books and their appearances on radio, television, and lecture platforms they need a never-ending supply of victims. To provide themselves with the victims they need, they resort to a merciless use of "guilt by association." The "experts," especially the ex-Communists and those with fascist leanings, turn out to beat the bushes in a man-hunt for people whom they can conveniently use. Their most important function is not to turn up real Communists, most of whom are already known to the F.B.I., but to assert brazenly that they have a sinister, underworld, instinctive knowledge that the kind of person you are is the kind of person a Communist is.

McCarthyism has not yet been successful in establishing thought control, but it is using well-tried propaganda methods in its effort to do so. In order to stop a well-

qualified independent expert from expressing his personal opinion, the McCarthy method is to accuse him of other things. Accuse him of being an espionage agent. Bring in a witness to accuse him, not on the grounds of what the expert has written, but on the ominous suggestion that he "organized" other writers. Accuse him of being the "architect of Far Eastern policy." Throw a bomb which emits clouds of nauseous smoke and then turn in a false fire alarm. The next step is to use the simple propaganda device of insisting over and over again, even weeks after complete evidence has disclosed the false alarm, that where there is so much smoke there must be some fire.

The use of seemingly logical phrases like "no smoke without fire" is only one kind of the dishonest logic which is the most terrifying and deadly technique of the smear charge. Another standard device uses the following pattern: The typical Communist is a man whose thinking is regimented with the thinking of other Communists, but has nothing whatever to do with the thinking of average Americans. Any man who thinks independently is in a minority; since the Communists are also a minority, accuse the independent thinker of being a Communist; then deny that he is thinking independently, and accuse him of being regimented along with the other Communists.

The McCarthy kind of politician resorts to Congressional immunity to build up his charges in a way that would be libelous if first made in the press or on the radio. But once the charge has been made under immunity, the quoting of it does not expose the press and radio to libel actions. A charge made under Congressional immunity has sensational news value. Under a pattern of journalism that

has, unfortunately, become frozen and conventional, press and radio are bound to follow up every angle of a sensational charge. But disproof is rarely sensational. An accusation is positive. It asserts that something sinister and exciting exists. Disproof is negative. It merely demonstrates that nothing sinister or exciting exists. If it doesn't exist, it is less "newsworthy" and gets a smaller headline and a smaller story. Since millions of people read only headlines, the accusation persists in the public mind.

The McCarthy demagogues who are working to destroy our traditional liberties have already made great gaps in the tradition of freedom which has made this country unique. They have been working to strengthen and to exploit politically a dark tide of unreasoning, hysterical fear. McCarthyism insists constantly, emotionally, and menacingly that the man who thinks independently thinks dangerously and for an evil, disloyal purpose.

The resulting danger to American democracy is clear and present. We are beginning to reflect in our own conduct that which we abhor in thought control as the Russians enforce it. We are repelled by the servile way in which every Soviet contribution either to the social sciences or to the natural sciences has to be certified by the writing in of paeans on the superiority of Marxism, tributes to Stalin as the source of all wisdom, invective against "bourgeois science," and attacks on scientists in democratic countries as camp followers of "capitalist imperialism."

It is time for us to wake up to the fact that the McCarthy tactics of bullying any man who stands up for an independent opinion are crowding us into setting up a similar vicious standard here in America. More and more we are

allowing thought-control questions to be asked. "How long is it since you last denounced the Russians? In your recent monograph on the pottery of the Hopi Indians why did you not insert an irrelevant but zealous glorification of the American Way? Can you produce evidence of having been denounced, within the last six months, by the American Communists? When were you last attacked in a Russian publication?"

The special pressure groups which promote McCarthyism have already succeeded in intimidating Washington to such an extent that fair-minded senators feel they have to be very cautious in coming even indirectly to the aid of its victims by establishing the real facts which disprove the accusations. They are political men, and they feel that they are in real danger if they attempt to go against a political tide. The pressure on them is made heavier by the fact that the Republicans are trying to stake out a claim to be the Kremlin of anti-Russian and anti-Communist ideology. The Democrats, in reply, are trying to show that they are just as anti-Russian and anti-Communist as the Republicans. As a result, both parties are to an alarming extent neglecting the most vital issue, which is the maintenance of democratic standards and practices in the face of *both* Communism and the demagoguery of the witch-hunters.

Most newspapers, moreover, are Republican or Democrat, and like congressmen and senators they feel the pressure either to prove that the Republicans are the noblest Red-catchers of them all or that the Democrats are not a step behind them on the trail of blood. Because some newspapers, radio programs, and motion pictures have

helped to swell the tide of emotion and panic, all of them are now in danger of being swept away by it.

Bully-boy politicians of the McCarthy stripe were the forerunners who softened up Germany for the coming of Hitler. They are demagogues who are skilled in the exploitation of fear. They aim at more than the intimidation of the individual. If the individual can be successfully intimidated, then whole areas of timidity can be created among politicians, in the press, on the radio, in the moving picture industry, and in schools and colleges. We have the grave and recent warning of history that once a whole society has been softened up in this way it is easy to create a demand for a leader who will resolve the confusion, impose conformity and regimentation, and install the fascism that is the final ambition of the demagogues.

The standards that the witch-hunters are trying to impose on us are the standards of propaganda, of mob thinking, and of thought control. They have no place in a free atmosphere of individual and independent thinking. We are therefore deeply involved in a double emergency. Within our own country, our traditional freedoms are being paralyzed by fear fostered by organized pressure groups which are hard at work to deepen the intimidation and make the paralysis more rigid. Beyond the shores of our own country, all the many constructive possibilities of our foreign policy are being frozen by the cold war. The freeze is already so deep that nothing is left of foreign policy but the cold war itself. And yet it should be obvious that the cold war offers no solution either for our own problems or for the problems of the world.

To find an escape from this emergency we must do two things. Within our own country, we must break the paralysis of fear and win our way back to the traditional American freedom to think and on the basis of independent thinking to express independent opinions. Beyond our shores, we must use this reasserted freedom in a grand attack on the problems of the cold war. We cannot say that one of these things ought to be done first and the other second. We must do both at the same time. We cannot first win freedom from fear at home and then exercise that freedom in an attempt to find a new and better foreign policy, nor can we try to end the cold war and then, with fear and suspicion lightened through the world, try to win freedom from fear at home. We can only succeed if we free ourselves from fear and win back our freedom to think, and in the very act of so doing make use of our freedom to think by boldly setting ourselves to the task of thinking our way out of the cold war.

We must, to begin with, do some fresh thinking about the problem of Communism, both in foreign policy and at home in America. We have already so deeply conditioned ourselves, psychologically, to using the word "Communism" as a danger signal to distinguish between countries that we can deal with and countries that we cannot deal with that we are going to find it hard to carry on a reasonable debate about our problems. We should take as an example and a warning the difficulty and delay we encountered in working out a sensible and practical policy toward Yugoslavia. Because the word "Communist" has a hypnotic effect on newspapers the State Department is always in danger of criticism

if it uses common sense in taking advantage of the fact that there are Communists in Yugoslavia and a number of other countries who are at the same time independent nationalists, and will therefore find ways of getting along with us if we show more respect for their independence than Russia does. The latest and greatest disaster in our foreign policy is another example of the hypnotic use of the word "Communist." By the violence of their objection to a government with even a few Communists in it the China Lobby and its friends in the Congress prevented us from helping to bring into being a moderate government in China and forced us to follow a policy that resulted in putting China completely under the power of the Communists. Demanding that we follow that policy to the bitter end, they are now in fact making us force China into complete alliance with and dependence on Russia.

In the future we are not going to be able to deal any better or any more promptly with such problems as these unless the people in America who study and write about them can safely engage in public debate without the threat of persecution for those who hold minority opinions. Our experts must be allowed to translate, publish, and discuss the writings of Russian, Chinese, and other Communists. They must be allowed to recognize that, regardless of whether the theories of these Communists are right or wrong, they are the theories that shape the lives of hundreds of millions of people under Communist rule. To that extent they are not only theories but political actualities, and must be dealt with as such. It will be the death knell of our democracy if we allow the McCarthys and such pressure groups as the China Lobby to establish

a party line of knowledge in such matters. Research must not be bounded by any kind of political doctrine. When the presentation of unpalatable knowledge becomes dangerous to the individual, the state itself is endangered.

The problems raised for us by Communism in Russia, Communism in countries not controlled by Russia, and the fact that there are also Communists in America are going to interact on each other in the future as do many other internal and external problems. This complex of problems will require American research workers, social scientists, and publicists to set strict standards for themselves, to defend these standards, and to establish a place for them in American public opinion.

Marxism and sub-varieties of Marxism are going to play a continuing part and a more and more complicated part in the world's affairs. Our national security in dealing with other countries, and also the health and vigor of our own political life at home, require careful study of Marxism in all its forms and all its divergent political organizations.

We cannot, for our own safety, entrust the expert study of Marxism only to reactionaries who are opposed to all forms of liberalism as well as to Marxism. Still less can we afford to place ourselves in the hands of people whose claim to be experts rests solely on the fact that they are ex-Communists. It is extremely rare to find an ex-Communist who is dispassionate enough to be able to keep separate his change of ideas and his personal antagonism toward people whose ideas he used to share. We certainly cannot afford to entrust the assessment of ideas, either in foreign policy or in politics at home, to men of whom we are never sure whether they are honestly treating ideas as ideas, or

pursuing personal vengeance against individuals or cliques among their former associates.

It is a perversion of all common sense to make renegades into heroes of our society, but McCarthyism has progressed so far that Senator Chavez has referred to the bitter fact that the man who has never been a Communist is being reduced to a low status because he cannot, like the ex-Communist, produce a certificate of former membership in the Communist Party. Moreover, we should remember that a Communist who has left the Communist Party may have genuinely quarreled with his former comrades and yet still be a subversive revolutionary, differing from other Communists merely in sectarian dogma.

The renegade Communist, like a deserter from the enemy in war, has a limited value for intelligence purposes which is greatest when he has just deserted. During the current tide of fear, however, a man who was high up in the Communist Party ten years ago is often consulted as if he were an authority on the inner workings of the Communist high command today — which he is not and cannot be.

It is not ex-Communists but independent researchers with a tradition of free expression who have made the most authoritative analyses and predictions of Marxism and Communist policy. In the long run a democracy must rely on independent, non-renegade experts as the only experts who can make a conscious and sustained effort to see things in perspective.

We are in one of those national crises in which the fundamental cause of liberty will either be seriously impaired or renewed and strengthened, depending on what we do. To break the grip of fear we must revive both the letter and the

spirit of the Bill of Rights, which have been violated by the witch-hunting method of intimidating government personnel and private citizens by denunciation. The United States was founded in a period of crisis, and men experienced in crisis hysteria insisted on adding to the Constitution provisions intended to protect citizens from unjustifiable prosecution.

The Bill of Rights that they wrote was sharply devised to meet the dangers of unjust arrest and imprisonment without trial — the principal dangers to which citizens were exposed in those days whenever there was a wave of mass hysteria or official persecution. A modern addition to that kind of danger is persecution by denunciation. Because of the media of mass publicity, such as the press and radio — particularly when a member of the Congress provides the occasion by abuse of the privilege of immunity, this kind of persecution and intimidation now goes on unchecked. Unless we see to it that persecution by denunciation is not allowed to happen here, we shall soon find that the Bill of Rights is a monument to the past rather than a bulwark against present evils.

The standards of Congressional investigation should be brought into line with modern requirements. A Senatorial committee of investigation works in a manner which is not comparable to trial by an impartial jury because it is impossible in face of a flood tide of political pressures to grant a fair trial. If we are to break the grip of fear, it is necessary to change the procedures of investigation to conform to the spirit of our Bill of Rights. The Senatorial committee of investigation is one of the indispensable “checks and balances” of our government but it must

protect individuals who are examined from losing their liberty and their property without due process of law. It is not within the concepts of our freedoms that appearance before a committee should involve a witness in unrelated political maneuvers nor should he be subject to unfair attacks made under Congressional immunity on the floor of either the House or Senate. No more cruel or unusual punishment can be devised than allowing a senator to make charges against individuals that he has not even attempted to substantiate with proof.

We have here a double problem to solve. One aspect of it concerns the security of the state, the other the security of the citizen. No one doubts that some appropriate method has to be devised to insure that people in key government positions are not subversive and are not serving as the agents of a foreign government. At the same time, where private citizens are concerned, we must realize that regardless of the existence of the cold war traditional American liberties are essential to the preservation of our constitutional system.

Of course we need in times like these an able and effective government agency to ascertain and check on persons who are subversive or foreign agents. The powers of this agency should be strictly limited and subject to constant review so that the agency does not gradually expand its function and bring under its jurisdiction people whose opinions are merely minority opinions.

The investigative committees of the Senate and House, with their broad powers, should of course be retained. Except for occasional aberrations such as those of the House Un-American Activities Committee under Con-

gressmen Martin Dies and J. Parnell Thomas, these committees have only occasionally misused the investigative process. But committee procedures badly need re-examination when they deal with the sensitive areas of freedom and the rights of individuals. I am not qualified to make specific suggestions, but on the basis of my own experience it seems to me of crucial importance that an accuser should be compelled to confront the persons he accuses. It should be possible to work out some procedure for cross-examination by the accused and his counsel.

I am convinced by my experience that it is most important that the Senate and House should devise methods for restraining their own members. Within the Congress, there are long-established and elaborate rules to control the denunciation of members by members. There should also be rules to protect private citizens from denunciation on the floor of the Senate or House. Accusations against individuals should be made to the investigative agencies of the government, or in the way any other citizen has to make them — in public, where if they are libelous they may be tested in a court of law.

It has now become an urgent necessity to protect ourselves against abuse of the campaign for security by people who, while proclaiming their patriotism, may themselves be guided by motives that are sinister or selfish. Huey Long, a cynical and unprincipled politician, long ago warned us that if fascism ever came to America it would come disguised as one hundred per cent Americanism. By the same token, one hundred and fifty per cent denunciation of vaguely and imprecisely defined "Reds" may be a disguise for those who would destroy democracy.

In a democracy, the independent thinker is indispensable both to the planning of a successful foreign policy and to the maintenance of our democratic traditions. There is no way to maintain his independence and make it available to the service of the nation except by defending the freedom of inquiry and opinion of one and all. This does not mean that Communists who actually organize for subversive purposes should not feel the weight of the law, or fascists, or Ku Kluxers who organize to intimidate any section of our society, or lobbyists for any foreign power, whether or not they receive pay from a foreign source, if they resort to vilification and intimidation of their fellow citizens in the interests of a foreign power. But action for subversive purposes should be kept separate, in our minds as well as in our laws, from freedom of opinion. The freedom of the majority is only safe if the freedom of the minority — any minority — is protected.

While we are restoring to the individual the protections of the Fifth and Sixth Amendments, restoring the dignity of the Congress, restoring the confidence of the public, and thus breaking the grip of fear at home, we must also renew our attack on the problems that face us throughout the world. We must do so through open debate, strengthened by the conviction that all opinions, including minority opinions, are entitled to a full hearing. We must renew our faith in this traditional way of a democratic society. We must not allow ourselves to be bulldozed by those who in the name of “discipline” or a supposed “national emergency” try to insist that debate be suspended and that in face of a totalitarian menace we should adopt the most

dangerous two-edged weapon of the enemy and make ourselves an authoritarian state.

As the heirs and guardians of the democratic tradition we must not allow men hungry for dictatorial power to impose upon us a regimented conformity of belief and opinion. But we must at the same time impose a reasoned and temperate self-discipline upon ourselves. Our right to resist dictatorship is rooted in our right to express opinions that are hateful to would-be dictators and authoritarians. The right to express an individual opinion is only secure if it includes the right to express a minority opinion; the right of minority opinion is only secure if it includes the right to express an unpopular opinion. Each of us must defend not only his own right to his own opinion. We must all unite to defend the right of any man to state opinions that challenge our own. What we must above all defend, as we value our own freedom, is the right of any man to his opinion, even if it offends powerful men or criticizes public authority.

We must defend this right because a healthy democratic society must be a living, growing, changing thing. To conserve its democratic character it must determine change, in the interest of the majority, through public debate which allows all minority interests and views to be represented and defended.

Those who demand that their own selfish interests be made paramount, and who for that reason oppose all change are obstructively antidemocratic. Those who seek first to encroach on and then to deny the rights and privileges of others in the greedy ambition to extend their

own rights and privileges are active subverters of democracy.

It is more than our democratic right to oppose these men. It is the most sacred of our duties. Free men must stand together or fall one by one. The free man can only assert his freedom in association with other free men. Unless freedom is practiced, it withers. Therefore to write freedom into law is not enough. It must be affirmed and reaffirmed in every generation.