

Mercer Island High School, Mercer Island, Washington

ADDRESS BY DR. GIOVANNI COSTIGAN
FEBRUARY 27, 1961

This evening I was to have addressed a P.T.A. meeting on this island. There would probably have been a small group of people present, and I had intended to speak about some aspect of education. Several months after the original invitation had been issued, it was suddenly withdrawn--without any reason being given. Soon it became known that the reason for this abrupt cancellation was that aspersions had been cast upon my personal integrity, and upon my loyalty as a citizen. I was given no opportunity to reply to these innuendoes, no opportunity to defend myself against such insinuations. The unintended result is this meeting at which I have the honor to speak to you tonight.

I should like to express my gratitude to the many residents of Mercer Island who have made this meeting possible--some of them I am privileged to count among my friends, but others were unknown to me personally until they demonstrated, by enabling me to speak on this occasion, their desire for justice and fair play. I am glad also to say that such support has transcended the usual lines of party politics and that both Republicans and Democrats have cooperated to make this meeting possible. Equally, therefore, I should like to thank those old friends whose loyalty has thus been demonstrated, and those new ones who have likewise renewed my faith in the fundamental strength of our democracy and in the basic decency of ordinary human beings.

While it is necessary to take this opportunity to refute the allegations that have been so freely and so irresponsibly made, I wish to indulge as little as possible in personal recrimination. This evening I do not intend to indulge in personalities, nor to accentuate whatever divisions may perhaps already exist upon the island as a result of this unfortunate episode. Indeed I should prefer not to be heard at all tonight, even in my own defense, were the result of my speaking to be an increase of discord or bitterness. On the contrary, nothing would give me more pleasure this evening than to feel that I had been able to do something, however little, to strengthen us all in a common purpose and to unite us all in a common resolve.

For it is clear beyond doubt that the issues which really confront us far transcend in importance any local disagreement or any injury inflicted upon a single person's feelings or reputation. The basic issue is survival. I do not wish to underestimate the seriousness of the challenge which faces us--a graver challenge, perhaps, than any which has faced this nation in past history. There opens out before us the prospect of an indefinitely protracted conflict--a political, economic, psychological and ideological conflict--for the ultimate control of the world. In such a struggle the factors which will count most will be--the strength of conviction with which we can support our own ideals, the degree of trained intelligence with which we can bring to bear upon the complex problems confronting us, and the maximum utilization of the resources--human and otherwise--at our disposal. The uncommitted nations who constitute the majority of mankind, will almost certainly align themselves in the end with whatever political system shows itself best equipped to meet this triple challenge.

What, then, are the ideals to which we as a democracy are committed? First among these I name political freedom--inherited from the American Revolution, from the long tradition of English parliamentary government which preceded that Revolution, and from the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century which provided freedom with its rationale, its intellectual justification. By freedom I mean not only the liberties guaranteed by the Bill of Rights--that supreme defense against the danger of tyranny or coercion by the State--but also the right of every citizen--perhaps I should say his duty--to participate freely and actively in political life.

Such a concept of freedom—as developed in that little masterpiece of analytical reasoning, John Stuart Mill's essay *On Liberty*—carries with it as its correlative, the duty of tolerance—of allowing others the same right to express their ideas and opinions which we claim for ourselves. This right to differ freely and openly, to express opinions which may be unpopular without being immediately branded as disloyal or unpatriotic, is basic in a political democracy, and as soon as this right is threatened, democracy itself is in jeopardy.

Such freedom not only enriches our own individual lives, but offers to the newly emergent nations of Africa and Asia the one irresistible argument with which Communism cannot compete, whatever the degree of the technological skill it may develop. Personal freedom may be regarded, therefore, as the supreme political asset possessed by the Free World, and by the Free World alone. For this reason one must hope that, in the immense struggle now taking place in Asia for the allegiance of millions of human beings, India rather than China may emerge as the ultimate victor.

As important as the principle of freedom in a democracy is the twin principle of equality—the equality of all individuals regardless of race, religion or color. The failure to extend to the Negro the full protection of the Constitution was no doubt the greatest shortcoming of the American Revolution, and the failure—after the Civil War—to educate the Negro and prepare him for active citizenship was perhaps the greatest failure of American life during the nineteenth century. In this centennial year of the outbreak of the Civil War, the nation is still paying dearly in the loss of an immense potential of human intelligence and labor, in political and social tensions, even, occasionally, in outright violence and death—for the legacy of unfinished business left by the nineteenth century. It is from this point of view that the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court in 1954 stands as so notable a landmark in American history, and in the history of democracy itself.

The question of racial equality, while it is undoubtedly the most urgent of all domestic problems, is also of supreme importance from an international point of view. On this issue more than on any other, we are judged by the majority of mankind; and all the material aid which we may lavish on the underdeveloped areas of the globe is stultified if we fail to observe and practice racial equality and justice at home. "Racial discrimination in the United States," declared the three senators who returned from Africa and reported to the Senate two weeks ago, "probably is the most important of all the natural barriers to a better understanding between Africa and this country." Even educated Africans, the senators emphasized, "react emotionally to instances of racial intolerance or violence in this country." And why not, one may ask? Since we in their place would react in precisely the same manner to the same insults and injuries.

Important, however, as Africa will be during the decade of the nineteen sixties, it is not Africa alone that is in question. Throughout Asia—in India and Vietnam as in Iran and Thailand—throughout the Moslem world from Morocco to Malaya, from Pakistan to Indonesia—the same passionate desire for the recognition of human equality is everywhere displayed. Each new example of racial injustice—whether in New Orleans or in Johannesburg—is a defeat for the Free World and a victory for communism, a defeat which is instantly captured and magnified by the cameras of newsmen and projected almost instantly on the television screen before the eyes of half the world. Every jeering white countenance, every insulting or derisive remark, is a gratuitous propaganda victory for communism. Nor is the irreparable damage of such thoughtlessness or folly confined to Africa and Asia: the greater part of the peoples of Latin America is also colored, and racial injustice here causes resentment everywhere south of the Border. When Mr. Nixon was stoned in Caracas he was also taunted with the epithet "Little Rock"—a word so charged with emotion that it was far more significant than the stones that were actually thrown.

The image of America, "as Mr. Harriman a few days ago declared, "must ever be that of the champion of freedom, of individual worth, dignity and equality--a nation deeply concerned with human progress." To hold these convictions that I have mentioned-- to cherish them and to act upon them--is the first condition of a healthy political and social life at home. Such convictions are also the indispensable link between America and the rest of the Free World. They bind us as closely on the one hand to Western Europe and the nations of the British Commonwealth as, on the other, to the uncommitted peoples of Asia, Africa and South America. If we fail or falter in our steadfast holding by these convictions, we shall assuredly lose the struggle for the allegiance of mankind. The moral leadership of America, without which her material abundance will be of small value, will assuredly never be accepted by the rest of the Free World unless we remain truly free at home.

Second only to the need to believe deeply in the principles of freedom and equality, and to act in daily life upon those principles, is the need to cultivate intelligence. One of the most disturbing aspects of our contemporary society is the prevalent climate of anti-intellectualism the widespread distaste for serious reading, the widespread distrust of serious thinking. Perhaps in no other country in the western world is trained intelligence--outside of that which can be translated immediately into technical achievement--so little valued as in the United States. One thinks, for example, of what might be accomplished, and of how little is actually being done, to educate the public through the modern miracle of television. One thinks wistfully of what knowledge and understanding of the world's problems could be conveyed, what intellectual curiosity and excitement awakened, what boredom and banality banished, if this marvellous new medium were harnessed more largely to the service of education instead of being so constantly debased as an adjunct to advertising. Instead of being encouraged to escape into the familiar nightly world of phantasy--of violence or infantilism--the public, unless one supposes it, as I do not, to be incorrigibly unresponsive, could be so easily brought to a more realistic understanding of contemporary problems both foreign and domestic--with consequent growth of intellectual maturity and balance. In a famous passage written more than thirty years ago, the English philosopher, Alfred North Whitehead, vividly described the fate which surely lies in wait for the uneducated, or the imperfectly educated nation, for the nation which fails to value trained intelligence.

In the conditions of modern life the rule is absolute, the race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed. Not all your heroism, not all your social charm, not all your wit, not all your victories on land or at sea, can move back the finger of fate. To-day we maintain ourselves. Tomorrow science will have moved forward yet one more step, and there will be no appeal from the judgment which will then be pronounced on the uneducated.

Through Whitehead naturally could not foresee the actual configuration of the present struggle for world power, his words are as applicable today as when they were written in 1929.

It is with such thoughts in mind that I approach the subject of the film-strip, Communism on the Map, which has recently caused controversy in this area. No one wishes to underestimate the gravity of the world situation which confronts us, or the severity of the challenge which faces us. Such a challenge, however, must be faced coolly, deliberately and rationally. In general, I am in entire agreement

with the approach to the crises, both national and international, which the present administration has outlined. The wrong way to approach the challenge of communism is to react in the way which this film-strip suggest--blindly, emotionally, and hysterically. For it contains no analysis whatever of the nature of communism; and makes no positive suggestion as to how communism may be prevented from making further conquests at the expense of the Free World.

The sponsors of the film-strip emphasize what they call its shock treatment of the public. When the film-strip was shown at the University, its defender actually told the student body that its object was not to teach, but to shock; a still better word would have been "demoralize". Is it any wonder that the students repudiated this suggestion that they could only be shocked, not educated, on the subject of Communism? In the realm of psychology, shock-treatment is not used upon healthy persons, but only upon those who are mentally ill. Do the makers of this film wish us to believe that our society is mentally diseased?

An illustration of the dangers inherent in shocking rather than informing people may be taken from the sphere of automobile accidents. "Scare warnings of traffic fatalities," observes a contemporary psychologist, "tend to frighten the average motorist and increase his determination to avoid accidents, but it is doubtful if desirable long - range results are achieved. Very few people will respond indefinitely to appeals that arouse anxiety and apprehension. Once the initial impact has spent its force, it may be replaced by an unconscious sense of anger and aggression, and thereby increase the motorist's accident potential."

The only conceivable effect of the film-strip under discussion is to promote national anxiety and unease, to increase suspicion and distrust, to breed irrational anger and hatred. The bitter dissensions which have occurred lately in this area, the degree of emotionalism which has been aroused, the almost unprecedented campaign of abuse and vilification against a single individual who dared to exercise the right of free speech and public criticism, even the threat of personal violence--such incidents furnish undeniable and tragic proof of the incendiary quality of the film-strip.

Before attempting to analyse it critically, however, I must allude to what appears to be, on the part of the sponsors of the film-strip, a deliberate attempt to mislead the public. The version which was shown at Boeing's and which was also seen by both faculty and students at the University, was sixty-four minutes long, and it was upon this version that the faculty letter of protest was based. Upon this complete version also my own criticisms have been founded. Lately, however, as if in response to such criticisms, a shorter and less deplorable, though still objectionable, version has been shown. It was this abbreviated version, lasting only thirty-three minutes, which was recently shown to the legislators in Olympia and at the large public meeting in the Orpheum theater. Why, one wondered, did not the sponsors of the film-strip avail themselves of this latter opportunity to show so large a section of the public the full-length version? Several persons (unknown personally to me) informed me by telephone of their indignation at having a bowdlerized or expurgated version thus palmed off upon them. Channel 13 also reported the other night that it had suddenly decided to show the watered down version rather than the longer one as previously planned. Can it be that the effects of criticism are already, however reluctantly, being acknowledged? The effect, however, of such substitution has been that those who have seen only the short version are in no position to evaluate the criticisms made of the long version, since many of the more grotesque falsehoods and distortions have been

deleted- and without the least acknowledgement to the public that a sort of censorship has been at work. This evening, at any rate, having given this warning, I intend to base my criticisms on the full-length version of the film-strip.

If one approaches the film-strip critically, one is struck by the fact that its almost certain result, whatever the intention of its makers, is to bring Communism closer to its goal of world domination. What are the objects of Communism at the present time? Surely they are these: (1) to break down the NATO alliance and destroy confidence between the United States and its closest Allies. This the film strip accomplishes by declaring, without a scrap of evidence, that there are Communists in the government of Canada today, and that most of Western Europe is virtually under Communist control--hence tinted pink upon the map. Nor is any evidence offered to support such an assertion as that in West German today, "Communists are present in every aspect of national thought." I doubt very much whether there is a single scholar or authority upon German politics today who would endorse such a statement. Even Franco's Spain and Salazar's Portugal are represented, contrary to all fact, as under Communist influence, and ready to fail under Communist control; while Catholic Ireland is described, with absolute falsehood, as being "deep in Socialism," virtually bankrupt, and "with strong communist calls in strategic spots which could take over in a crisis." Statements like this suggest a lurking anti-Catholic bias which one would expect from a fundamentalist college in the South. Such, in any event, are some of the falsehoods and insinuations by which mutual trust between ourselves and our Allies is destroyed, and the Atlantic Community--whose unity and diversity is the world's best hope of freedom today--shattered into fragments.

The second object of Communism today is to gain control of the uncommitted nations of the world, to win the allegiance of the hundreds of millions of human beings in India, South East Asia, Africa and South America. This film-strip implies that these huge areas are already lost to the communists, and that they are now, directly or indirectly, under Communist control. Thus at the outset, any ideas of winning them over to our side, by Point Four programs and technological assistance, by helping them to overcome their age-old problems of poverty, disease, starvation and illiteracy, is rendered useless. What is the use of President Kennedy's proposal for a Peace Corps, which has already by its creative possibilities and imaginative daring, appealed to the youth of this nation as nothing else has done since the early days of the New Deal--what is the use of such a project if Africa and Asia are already under Communist control?

The third object of Communism is to isolate the United States from the rest of the world. This communist aim, which we hope will never be realized, is represented, in this film-strip as already an accomplished fact. The dangers of isolationism were demonstrated by the impotence of the League of Nations during the years of Hitler's rise to power, but one had thought that in this respect the Second World War had taught us all a lesson--that American interests were inextricably intertwined with world affairs, and that we could not escape the moral leadership of the Free World through the United Nations which our unrivaled material strength had forced upon us. The pernicious lesson of this film-strip is that our salvation today lies in the abandonment of the whole of the rest of the world, by returning to a wholly impracticable and anachronistic dream of isolation.

The fourth and last object of communism is to weaken our resistance by dividing and confusing us at home, by sowing throughout the nation seeds of suspicion and dissension, by casting discredit upon our national leaders and doubt upon the value of our democratic institutions. Repeating the late Senator McCarthy's charges of "Twenty years of treason," and his venomous unsubstantiated charges against the late General George Marshall, the film-strip falsely represents President Roosevelt in 1933 as having saved Russia from bankruptcy, and President Truman as having betrayed China to the communists in 1947. The chief evidence for the latter statement is the

Wedemeyer report, which in fact severely condemned Chiang's government for its tyranny, corruption and inefficiency, and recommended that no further aid be given to the Nationalists unless they effected drastic reforms in the government—a prospect which Wedemeyer himself thought to be unlikely. Not only the Democratic Party, however, is smeared in this fashion. Mr. Nixon is unfairly ridiculed as being the dupe of Castro, while it is flatly stated that (after eight years of Republican administration) there are still communists in the government.

If the leaders of both parties have thus been duped by our enemies, the conclusion would seem to be the total discrediting of the democratic process itself, and the implication that only a military dictatorship can save us—the very thing against which Mr. Eisenhower warned, so gravely and soberly, in his farewell address to the nation. The same technique of this gratuitously casting aspersions upon democratic institutions may be seen in the reference to the Supreme Court, which is described by Richard Arens, formerly Staff Director of the Un-American Activities Committee, as having all but wrecked the structure of internal security. What else can be the effect of such reckless and irresponsible accusations other than breed universal cynicism and distrust at home?

One major falsehood running throughout the film-strip is the identification of liberal movements of the welfare state in Britain, democratic socialism in Scandinavia, with Russian Communism. The fundamental distinction between communist and free societies is the absence from the former of individual freedom and private property. But personal freedom and private property are actually preserved in countries such as Britain, Scandinavia, Austria, Israel and India. One of the most vital outposts, incidentally, of the Free World today, is West Berlin—a socialist municipality led by a courageous socialist Mayor, Willy Brandt.

The film-strip constantly stresses the point that socialism leads inevitably to communism, when in point of fact the opposite is the case. Countries such as Britain, Scandinavia and Israel, precisely because they have achieved internal health and strength through liberal reforms, have nothing to fear from domestic communism. The sole evidence for the thesis that socialism leads inevitably to communism is provided by quotations from the Marxist scriptures to this effect. The prophecies contained in these scriptures, even when belied by subsequent events, are regarded by the makers of the film-strip as being entirely valid and still worthy of credence. Personally I do not attribute infallibility to Marx or Lenin or any other communist writer. Nothing could undermine our self-confidence more than to represent the Soviet leaders as supermen who have never made a mistake. Yet that is precisely what this film-strip does. In point of fact, the communist leaders have made a number of serious blunders or miscalculations during the past forty years. These include among others (1) the failure of communist revolution in Germany in 1919-20, on which Lenin staked all his hopes (2) the alienation by Stalin of Tito's Yugoslavia (3) the refusal by the Russians of aid offered under the Marshall Plan to the countries of eastern, as well as western, Europe (4) the terror practiced by Communist China upon Tibet which alienated many of the Buddhist peoples of south-eastern Asia (5) the attack upon the borders of India and the invasion of Indian territory, several thousand square miles of which the communists still occupy—an act of unnecessary and incomprehensible aggression which has today produced strong anti-Chinese feelings throughout India.

In one of his earliest press conferences the new Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Rusk, emphasized that President Kennedy's administration is as much opposed to tyranny from the Right as from the Left. The film-strip, however, supports one type of police state against another. Thus, in speaking of Cuba, it only regrets that the United States did not supply more bullets to Batista, a policy which would certainly have alienated most of our friends in South America. Nowhere does it suggest that the right policy to have pursued in Cuba would have been to use our utmost influence to urge liberal reforms upon Batista while there was still time. Nowhere it is suggested that the policy of Governor Munoz in Puerto Rico is the right way, as contrasted with the right and left dictatorships of Batista and Castro.

In addition to these objections to the film-strip, not about points of detail--of which many more instances could be cited--but in matters of fundamental policy and approach, there are two instances of deliberate dishonesty which should be mentioned. The message of the film is based upon a spurious text, falsely attributed to Lenin, which, were it true, would have revealed him as possessed of powers of almost prophetic insight. Searching carefully through Lenin's works, the Research Division of the Library of Congress has been unable to find any such statement in Lenin's writings. Although this falsehood was exposed more than two years ago, the makers of the film-strip deliberately chose it as their text. The second instance of deliberate dishonesty is the fraudulent use of a photograph to discredit President Roosevelt. Immediately after the mention of his decision in 1933 to give diplomatic recognition to Russia, a picture is flashed on the screen which purports to represent the signing of a Russian-American agreement. But if one looks closely, Mao-tse-tung, then an unknown rebel in the mountains of China, is standing next to Stalin, while Vyshinsky, who was not yet even in the Foreign Office, is actually signing the document. The occasion, in fact, appears to have been the signing of the Sino-Soviet treaty of 1950, and this is deliberately pushed back seventeen years in time in order to smear President Roosevelt's memory fifteen years after his death. One hardly knows which is more astonishing--the bare faced fraud itself or the clumsiness with which it was enacted. The fraudulent use of photographs, moreover, is only too reminiscent of the methods of the late Senator McCarthy. We are all too familiar with the communist technique of history writing--the elimination of Trotsky from Russian history books and the manipulation of historical events to follow each latest twist of the party line. But is it necessary for the Free World also to defend itself by resorting to such shabby and dishonest devices?

It may be objected that the distortions of history contained in the film-strip are so great, and the falsehoods so flagrant and numerous, that it is scarcely worth the attention of educated people to pay attention to them. It is impossible, for two main reasons, to accept this line of argument: (1) the film could not be ignored since it was being sponsored as an educational service by powerful interests both in industry and in the armed services. (2) as a result of the emotional atmosphere generated by the film-strip, teachers in the public schools--especially in history and the social sciences--were being intimidated, both inside and outside the classroom, from the free expression of their opinions.

No reputable university or college in the nation would have lent itself to so crude and false a representation of modern history. Masquerading beneath the grandiose title, National Education Programs, is a small, educationally-undistinguished institution called Harding College, Searcy, Arkansas--actually less a center

of higher education than a propaganda-mill for the manufacture of pictures such as the one under discussion. As the Nation observed over ten years ago: "An obscure denominational college in the South West may well be exerting a greater influence on the economic thinking of the American people than most of our large universities." The sad truth of this observation has been amply demonstrated during the past several weeks in the metropolitan area of Seattle--two thousand miles away from rural Arkansas.

Ever since the specific and detailed charges of falsehood, of which I have given some examples, were first made, not a single one of them has been refuted or denied. Yet the film-strip states at one point: "These are facts, categorically stated, not reports or charges, but documented facts." Similar assertions were repeated throughout the film. Yet when inquiry was made from the Canadian Consul-General's office as to the basis for the very serious allegation made against the Canadian government, the sole reply vouchsafed by the local distributor of the film-strip was that he had seen it in some magazine--which one he could apparently not remember.

It is significant that the supporters of the film-strip have never allowed a debate to take place under their auspices on the merits of the film. The critics of the film-strip, however, confident of the truth of their position, have constantly invited public debate and free discussion of the merits of the picture. It is, incidentally, absolutely false to state, as many have done, that the critics of the film-strip have sought to suppress it. Nothing could be further from the truth. The critics of the film favor free speech, not censorship, and desire only an opportunity to discuss the factual contents and the probable effect of this document with a view to exposing its fallacies and dangers.

Actually, only one reply has so far been made in answer to the criticism of the film-strip. That reply has taken the form of a violent personal attack upon the character and integrity of the person who dared expose such falsehoods in public. That person happened to be myself. For the last month I have been exposed to an increasingly vicious campaign of innuendo and calumny, designed to besmirch my loyalty, to ruin my reputation and to blast, if possible, my career. I have received numerous abuse and insulting post cards and telephone calls--all of them anonymous. My wife has been similarly abused and insulted. One wonders how people continue to sustain their own self-respect, when they do not even dare to sign their name to their opinions, when they prefer to work secretly and in the dark and when their weapons are poisoned rumors and deliberate slander. There was even a threat against my life. Such is the penalty for daring to indulge the basic liberty of freedom--in this case, freedom of speech, in our society today. The makers of this film-strip profess the desire to promote good Americanism and to preserve the American heritage. Is it good Americanism to destroy freedom of speech, and is it part of the American heritage to stifle free discussion by threats of violence? The minds of these men are far indeed from that saying attributed to Lord Bacon: "The nobler a soul, the more objects of compassion it hath." In this connection I would like to quote a passage from a letter by a colleague of mine, personally unknown to me, who teaches at the University.

The threats and frenetic criticism which Professor Costigan has received as a result of his sober evaluation of the film, "Communism on the Map," are deeply disturbing.

A man widely known as a most articulate champion of western democratic traditions has his words ignored and his intent twisted to a defense of communism. A scholar speaking in the special area of his professional competence is subjected to vilification and intimidating threats. What a chilling look we are having at the anti-rational, the violent, and the brutal facets of our society.

I pass therefore to the smear-sheet which was distributed about me in this island, in the city of Seattle, on the campus of the University and which even, on one occasion, appeared in my own classroom. So far from dreading the charges contained in this smear-sheet, I caused them to be published in the University of Washington Daily, in order that I might at least have the opportunity to refute the innuendoes which they contained. I propose to quote a portion of my remarks on that occasion.

In the first place, I wonder why, if anyone wished to ascertain my political views, he did not consult any of the numerous people in the University who have long been acquainted with them, and some of whom have known me for over twenty years? In support of the preposterous insinuation that I have sought to further the aims of communism, or have been the dupe of communists, six pieces of alleged evidence are offered—covering the twenty-seven years during which I have had the honor to teach at the University. It is necessary to comment on each of them.

The first charge is that on February 9, 1939, I presided at a fundraising meeting for the Abraham Lincoln Brigade. According to the Seattle Post Intelligencer (2/10/39), the real object of the meeting was to raise funds for the Spanish Loyalist Medical Bureau—to help the wounded and to succor the refugees uprooted from their homes as a result of Franco's mutiny against the legitimate government of Spain—and to aid those wounded members of the Brigade who had returned to Seattle. A brief factual summary is necessary to recall today the position of the great majority of Americans who, like myself, supported the Spanish Republic during the Civil War of 1936-39. The Spanish government which Franco attacked was not Communist. It was actually less socialist than is Franco Spain today. Its program did not include the nationalization of mines, railways, land or even of the Bank of Spain. It did, however, for the first time in Spanish history, introduce such reforms as a low minimum wage, an eight-hour day, and arbitration boards in industrial disputes. It had established a humane penalcode, had emancipated women and had legalized civil marriage and divorce. It had also separated church and state, and broken the virtual monopoly of the Church over education. (See Gerald Brenan's objective book, The Spanish Labyrinth). The Republic commanded the allegiance of the great majority of the middle class and of the intellectuals (students and teachers), as well as of the peasants and working men of Spain. When Franco, supported by Hitler and Mussolini, attempted to overthrow the Republic by force, the latter appealed to France and Britain for the right to purchase arms in self-defence. This internationally-recognized right of any legitimate government was denied by the Western powers, and hence in desperation the Republic appealed as a last resort to Soviet Russia for aid. The tragic price paid for such aid was the ultimate betrayal of Republican Spain by the communists. (See George Orwell's poignant Homage to Catalonia).

The second charge is that I am a member of the Civil Liberties Union. The American Civil Liberties Union is not, and never has been, communistic or in any way connected with the communist cause. It exists to protect those basic civil liberties of our democracy which are threatened by any form of totalitarianism. I am proud to belong to it, and wish that more of my fellow citizens cared sufficiently about freedom to join it. Last year Governor Nelson Rockefeller of New York wrote to congratulate the American Civil Liberties Union on the occasion of its fortieth anniversary. "This is an occasion," the Governor observed, "that well merits public observance. It is of the utmost importance that our civil liberties be preserved intact and untarnished. This we need not only for individual self realization but, also, as an example to the rest of the world." Ten years earlier, President Truman had declared: "The integrity of the American Civil Liberties Union and of its workers in the field has never been, and I feel, never will be questioned. Officers, directors and members of the Union have performed outstanding service to the cause of true freedom." After these and similar endorsements alike from Democratic and Republican leaders, the A.C.L.U. can well afford to ignore the reckless charges of a vindictive minority group which has never shown much regard for the civil rights of others.

The third charge is that in 1943 I signed a resolution opposing the Dies Committee. I protested against the Dies Committee for the same reasons that I protest today against its successor, the House Un-American Activities Committee. Both have abused the investigative power of Congress and usurped the functions of a court of law. It is absolutely false to suggest that anyone who opposes such committees is thereby furthering the Communist cause. Governor Nelson of Wisconsin recently urged the abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee as having "violated constitutional rights of freedom of speech and of public assembly. In an effort, "said Governor Nelson, to combat a system that denies these freedoms, the committee has undermined the very freedoms that most distinguish our democracy from the communist system."

The fourth and fifth charges concern two speeches that I made years ago. Out of several hundred speeches which I must have made during the last twenty years before all sorts of organizations--political, social, religious, educational, fraternal--it is noteworthy that my accusers can find only two to call in question. One was a talk on Mr. Attlee's government, given in 1947 to the Seattle Labor School, at a time when that school was not yet even listed by the attorney general. In any case, I knew nothing of the background or origin of the school. I simply received a request to speak about the Labor government and I acceded to that request. The other talk was one given to a group of law students on the campus, at the request of several who had been in my classes. Their newly established organization--the National Lawyers Guild-- was not at that time cited by either of the bodies mentioned on the fact sheet, and even today is not listed by the Attorney General. I simply spoke one noon hour to a student group as I might next week if asked to do so. Ten years later, however, this may become evidence of disloyalty. On each of these occasions I spoke in good faith to two groups who had invited me to do so, without having the least knowledge that in either case there was presumed to be anything politically objectionable about the group in question. These two speeches, incidentally, constitute less than 1% of the talks I have actually given. In this biased reckoning, the overwhelming majority of talks given, and of the groups before which they were

delivered, have been ignored. This hardly suggests a desire for either justice or fair play.

The sixth and last charge is that I supported the opening of a Second Front in 1942. It is a gratuitous piece of malice and untruth to state, as does this smear-sheet, that if anyone at that time supported a Second Front, his sole object was to help Russia. As Mr. Eisenhower makes clear in his book, Crusade in Europe, the opening of a Second Front was at that time the official policy of the United States Government! Even General Wedemeyer in his autobiography makes it clear that Gen. Marshall's demand for a Second Front was "militarily sound" and designed not primarily to help Russia but to end the war at the earliest possible moment. "Senator Joe McCarthy," he writes, "who popularized the idea that Gen. Marshall was a 'second fronter' for sinister reasons, was absolutely wrong."

Apart from the military aspects of the Second Front, anyone who recalls those anguished days will remember also the millions of slave-laborers—Frenchmen, Dutchmen, Norwegians, Belgians, Poles, Czechs and Germans—who were herded into Nazi slave-labor camps, as well as millions of Jews and others who were being systematically gassed to death in Auschwitz and other places of infamy. Is it too much to suggest that one reason which weighed with those who urged a Second Front was the desire to see these unspeakable horrors terminated at the earliest possible moment?

There was, moreover, during those war years one acid test by which sympathizers with Communism could be distinguished from those who sympathized with democracy. Until Hitler attacked Russia on June 22, 1941, the official line of the Communist party was that the European conflict was merely a war between two rival Imperialisms, British and German. Actually, since Hitler was then the ally of the Soviet Union, in the eyes of the Communists Britain was more culpable than Nazi Germany and hence any attempt to render aid to Britain by America was totally condemned by Communists. Now in February, 1941, all faculty members of the University of Washington publicly urged "effective and immediate aid to Britain in her valiant fight against Hitler. I was one of those who signed this statement (Seattle Post Intelligencer 2-24-41), nor should I have been able to preserve self-respect had I not done so. This clear and unequivocal proof that I was not seeking to further communist ends was of course ignored by my present accusers.

To anyone who believes in democratic freedom, or even in ordinary decency, the methods of those who so diligently compiled this smear-sheet stand self-condemned. Years ago these same charges were raised by the Canwell Committee. Presumably they were held to be insubstantial, since no action was taken on the basis of them. Now, twelve years later, in what Bishop Pike has recently called "the grass-roots McCarthyism" of 1961, they have been exhumed from the proceedings of that discredited committee to serve as the basis for a new persecution.

I am reliably informed that my principal accuser also regards as subversive anyone who supports the following organization: the United Nations, UNICEF (a society

whose object was to relieve the sufferings of children abroad), the World Affairs Council, the Great Decisions program (sponsored by the Seattle Junior Chamber of Commerce), the Foreign Policy Association. Any support of civil rights or of racial justice and equality is also suspect in the eyes of such witch hunters. Clearly it is safer not to belong to any organization at all, and to take no stand on any public issue whatsoever. Such a course would mean the end of democracy in this country.

You will notice that the last charge on this smear-sheet refers to the year 1950. I have lately been informed of an incredible rumor which has recently been circulating in Seattle. It is now being whispered that for the last ten years I have been an under-cover man of the Party, and that I have only just decided to come out in my true colors. No motive is assigned for this sudden voluntary courting of ruin. One might have thought that a real subversive would have preferred to remain under cover and not offer himself for self-destruction.

Actually, during the past ten years, as any number of friends at University can testify, I have spoken on many occasions in support of what I regarded as the positive aims of American foreign policy. Thus I supported the Marshall Plan which (in 1947) saved Western Europe from the danger of Communist revolution and which I still regard as perhaps the greatest single act of American statesmanship since the second World War. I supported the Truman Plan for aiding Greece and Turkey to resist Soviet aggression in the Near East. I supported the British and American air-lift to West Berlin which saved that city from the danger of starvation during the Soviet blockade of 1948. I supported Mr. Truman's instant and courageous decision to repel the invasion of South Korea in 1950 - a decision which marked the end of such Soviet aggressions. I have also condemned the brutality of the Chinese in Tibet, and their invasion of territory on the borders of India. I have never advocated unilateral disarmament, and after reading what has appeared in the press about the Gaither and Rockefeller reports I have expressed more than once in public my alarm lest this country was actually falling behind in the missile race. I have constantly urged that the Western Allies remain firm and united on the question of West Berlin, since the loss of this key-city today a symbol of freedom not only for Germany but for the whole of Western Europe would demoralize the free peoples of Europe and probably lead to the end of NATO.

Most recently, I endorsed as strongly as I could President Kennedy's call to the youth of the nation to enrol itself in an arduous, self-sacrificing movement to bring succor to the millions in Asia and Africa who, if the West cannot or will not provide aid and leadership, will most assuredly look to the Soviet Union for help. I had the honor last month to be the speaker at the opening drive to launch support for the Peace Corps at the University of Washington, as a result of which some 2000 students signed up to indicate their interest in the proposal. As Arnold Tynbee has aptly said, these "lay missionaries" may well be the twentieth century successors of those nineteenth century religious missionaries who, as he truly remarked "sacrificed comfort and prosperity at home to serve a great cause abroad. They are representatives of whom Americans may be proud." But today how can these lay missionaries bearing with them the American faith in the freedom and dignity of man, be successful abroad when morale at home is undermined by such suspicion and fear? I may also mention that I have consistently supported the valiant little state of Israel in her gallant struggle against great odds-and this at a time when one of the chief objects of Soviet policy in the Middle East has been the cooing of Arab Nationalism by encouraging the liquidation of Israel: hence the supply of massive military aid - guns, tanks, planes, and submarines- of Nasser's Egypt. At the present moment, I support the general policies

of Mr. Hammarskjold in the United Nations and believe absolutely in his integrity.

To any rational person, the advocacy of such causes as these must seem curious from one who is said to be a communist sympathizer. They are not curious, however, as coming from a liberal; and there can be no doubt that what really lies behind this campaign of hate and falsehood is a hatred of liberalism itself, and of myself as a defender of it. In this context the attacks which have been made upon me cease to be incomprehensible and acquire meaning-in fact a very sinister meaning. For the showing of the Film-Strip and the slandering of those who dare to criticize it (the National Council of Churches, as well as faculty members of the University of Washington) appear to be part of a nation-wide totalitarian movement to destroy liberty at home under the guise of protecting it from communism abroad.

As readers of William L. Shirer's recent book, The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich, will be aware, it was a precisely similar attack upon the Weimar Republic, under pretext of defending it against communism, which helped to the suppression of German liberties and the triumph of Hitler. The wealthy German industrialist, Fritz Thyssen, bitterly recalled in his autobiography, those German industrial and military interests which helped Hitler's rise to power, were themselves later destroyed by him. One has nothing but horror for the infamous system which took the lives of six million innocent human beings in the gas-chambers of Auschwitz, Buchenwald, Belsen, Dachau and elsewhere. One has an equal horror for the mass-purges of Russia and the concentration camps of Stalin, as described in such works as Alexander Weissberg's The Accused, Alexander Barmine's one who survived, Joseph Scholmer's Vorkuta, Alexander Orloff's Secret History of Stalin's Crimes, the Petrovs Empire of Fear and numerous other books.

Anyone who bears in mind the tragic history of Europe during the last thirty years will realize that the enemy of liberalism is totalitarianism, from whatever quarter it may come--whether from the Right or from the Left. For the United States today, the danger abroad is obviously from the Left, but at home, attempting to capitalize upon that danger, is the growing threat from extremists of the Right whose activities have been documented so exhaustively in a recent publication of the University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science--The Right Wing. These are the people who put out the propaganda film-strip, Communism on the Map, at Harding College in Searcy, Arkansas, and their aim appears to be the suppression of freedom of speech and freedom of criticism by a monstrous identification of these basic democratic rights with communism itself.

The irrational and abusive use of the word "Communism" has reached truly frightening proportions. In California Bishop Pike is being denounced as a communist by those who do not share his theological views; in this city a public-spirited lady, whose interests are not primarily political, has been called a communist because she campaigned against billboards along the highways; by some Rightist groups fluoridization is regarded as a communist plot to sap the vitality of the nation and enable the Reds to take over; by others, as in Kent, a personality test, like that developed at the University of Minnesota, is held to be an example of "Communist Brainwashing;" in Louisiana, and in many parts of the South, anyone who advocates political freedom and social justice for the Negro is denounced as a communist; while in the present controversy here, one who has defended liberalism all his life is now being denounced on that score. Examples could no doubt be multiplied indefinitely. Every petty dictator, like Trujillo, whose tyranny is criticized by

honest men naturally calls his critics communists. In fact, to label some one as a communist is becoming a technique for silencing all opposition.

Whether a given thing is good or not, we must decide on the merits of the case itself and on the basis of our own best judgment. It must not be decided because some other person or group approves or condemns. If our conscience approves something as being good, that thing does not cease to be so because our enemy also happens to approve of it. Thus alcoholism, juvenile delinquency and crime are evil in themselves, and do not cease to be so because the Soviets in their cities are also engaged in combating them. The desire for racial equality and justice is a supremely good thing, regardless whether or not the Communists also profess to believe in it: actually the communists for their own ends support this cause in the United States, while continuing to practice discrimination against the Jews in Soviet Russia. On the other hand, the evil myth of racial supremacy—a myth which the Nazis used as a pretext to send six million innocent people to their death—remains an evil even though the Russians also condemn it. Abraham Lincoln remains a truly great and tragic symbol of the nobler aspirations of humanity whether or not the communists attempt to utilize his name for their own purposes. The same applies to Garibaldi, the liberator of modern Italy—a simple, modest, selfless man who redeemed his country from tyranny: he too remains great even though the communists in Italy attempt to exploit the propaganda value of his name. Democracy itself remains a valid political ideal even though the communists also attempt to appropriate the word to their sole use.

A free people must decide for itself what are its true values, and not let someone else decide, and then react automatically against whatever decision that may be. Since the close of the second World War, far too much of our thinking has been conditioned merely by a passive reaction against whatever position the Soviets might adopt. Such a policy allows the initiative in politics to pass wholly into the hands of our enemies, and condemns us to a purely negative and sterile position. If our leadership in the world is to be effective, it must be positive, and creative in its aims.

In the present crisis it is not alone my character and reputation that are at stake, but also the very existence of liberalism of which I am but one defender among many. In this particular struggle, should the forces of liberalism be defeated as I am confident they will not be—it would be the signal for a renewed and intensified attack upon the liberal spirit everywhere. The health of any social body depends upon its inherent vitality and power to throw off infection, and if our community is able—as I trust it will be able—to throw off this particular infection, it will emerge from this ordeal purified and strengthened, and with its future power of resistance to possible further infection vastly increased. And I hope that in that case, the example of our state of Washington may give heart and courage to the rest of the nation; for let us make no doubt about it, in what Bishop Pike has justly called "the grass-roots McCarthyism" of 1961, the attack on liberalism is nation-wide. Since Senator McCarthy's death, the totalitarian forces of the right have been re-grouping. As in the case of Harding College, they are amply supplied with funds, the source of which might well be investigated and brought to light. They have developed a considerable degree of organization and a variety of fronts through which they work. It is my hope that by a resistance such as ours, we may bring into the open and defeat this totalitarian movement, posing as the nation's sole champion against communism, before it is well-established in our midst.

The reactionary groups of the extreme Right--such as those which for the past the past ten months have harassed and persecuted the school authorities in the town of Kent--are small in number. The University of Illinois publication to which I have alluded puts their number at present at less than 2% of the nation--but even this modest estimate yields the rather frightening total of some three million persons. It is not so much the size of the extremists of the Right which is alarming, as the apathy or indifference of the majority. As Rabbi Leo Baeck of Berlin declared in the midst of Hitler's persecution: "It is difficult to tell which in the course of time has been more pernicious, the intolerance that commits the wrong, or the indifference that beholds it unperturbed." And I am sometimes reminded in these troubled days of those lines of the Irish poet, William Butler Yeats, which were so often in one's mind during the Thirties: "The best lack all Convictions, while the worst are full of passionate intensity."

The public lack of information about the actual course of historic events in modern history is cynically abused in the film-strip under discussion: let the public, say its defenders, judge for itself. But how many members of the public are sufficiently acquainted with the Wedemeyer Report--to take a single crucial illustration--to know that the general's conclusions were largely at variance with what the film-strip suggests? How many people will notice, or even suspect, such a fraudulent use of photographs as the one already cited? How many people are sufficiently acquainted with the history of the British Labor Party during the last sixty years, or the modern history of Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Finland to know whether the allegations made against these countries in this film-strip are true or false? How many people know enough about Ireland today to realize that the charge of socialism in Ireland is grotesque? Or how many people know that not a single satellite country in Europe fell to the Russians, as the film-strip states, by infiltration--the truth being that they fell to the Russian armies in the second World War or, as in the tragic case of Czechoslovakia, by a coup d'etat supported by Russian armies on the borders of the state? I agree with the makers of the film that the public needs to be alerted--but it needs to be alerted to a calm and rational estimate of the danger that confronts us, and to the appropriate means, consistent with the preservation of our basic democratic principles, whereby the danger may be overcome.

I have had the honor of teaching at the University of Washington for about a quarter of a century. During that period, I have endeavored through a medium of history to inculcate respect and reverence for human freedom, and for the political institutions in which, after centuries of travail and bloodshed, that freedom has been embodied--that freedom which we today inherit and of which at a moment like this we are now called upon to show ourselves worthy. I donot share the cynicism shown by the makers of the film-strip for our political institutions and I appeal to all decent people--conservatives and liberals, Republicans and Democrats alike--to defend these institutions and the rights which they embody against any form of totalitarian assault or undermining.

I cherish the hope that in my years at the University I have been able to strengthen the beliefs of young people in the value of their democratic inheritance, to make them more aware than they may previously have been of the true and deep significance of this inheritance, and to encourage them to preserve and defend it in the future. The persecution and abuse which I myself have lately suffered is no more than a single small incident--however deplorable--in the life of the University. (Perhaps I may be allowed in passing to remark, that only last week, a distinguished alumnus of the University of Washington, Mr. Samuel Baker, of the Dupont Company, speaking at the centennial banquet held in the Olympic Hotel, condemned the film-strip as worthless

and commended those faculty members who had publicly protested and who thereby, in his judgment, had vindicated the finest traditions of the University—a statement which unhappily was not reported in the press.)

I conclude by expressing the earnest hope that the ultimate result of such unfortunate episodes as those which have brought about this meeting, may be to strengthen our faith in democracy and to prove its capacity to meet whatever internal challenges the abuse of the liberty which it permits makes possible. Lastly I wish to thank the residents of Mercer Island for receiving me, a stranger, into their midst and for allowing me, in what I regard as the best traditions of American democracy, to vindicate myself tonight against the attacks which have been made upon my character and reputation.

APPENDIX

Some ideas expressed in 1939 in a book by Mr. John Foster Dulles called War, Peace and Change are pertinent to a discussion of the film-strip, COMMUNISM ON THE MAP. I reproduce some relevant passages here. They may be compared with the passage previously quoted from the philosopher, Alfred North Whitehead.

Totalitarian wars are made possible by a series of circumstances of which the most significant is the essentially emotional quality of human beings. We like to feel that reasoning and logical argument are the most persuasive means of inducing human action. Actually this is far from being the case. In only a small segment of our lives are our acts dictated by reason. In the main we act unthinkingly, under the impulse of emotional and physical desires or in accordance with tradition or the custom of the social group of which we happen to form a part. (pp. 55-6)

Modern invention and scientific technique have tended to enlarge very greatly the ability to generate mass emotional waves. It has become possible to subject an entire people simultaneously to the impact of emotional appeal. Much has been learned as to the use of sound, color and form in arousing emotional reactions. Much has been learned as to the cumulative emotional intensities obtainable from the massing of human beings together. (pp. 56-7)

There have in the past been times and conditions when human beings were sufficiently isolated to render difficult such simultaneous emotional impacts. Under such conditions slogans and emotional appeals still had their influence, for man's nature was as emotional then as it is now—perhaps more so. But conditions were such that it was necessary to depend more upon fact and reason. Sound reasoning and simple factual statements have permanency whereas emotionalism is transitory. (pp. 56)

We have pointed to the essentially emotional nature of human beings, particularly in the mass. Upon this foundation is built that form of patriotism which personifies the nation as a living being endowed with heroic qualities, who lives bravely and dangerously in a world of inferior and even villainous, other-nation personalities. (pp 57-8)

In order to build up the desired personification, history, in each nation, is written and taught in the manner of the dime novel. Emphasis is placed on dramatic episodes--war and adventure--which stir the imagination and arouse admiration and hero worship. In order to secure a maximum of emotional excitement, one or more other nations are cast in the role of "villains." One's own hero, always in the right, is in constant peril from such other nations. (p. 58)

There are also those who are not duped by the nation-hero, nation villain, personifications. They are, perhaps, those who have had occasion to travel about the world and to become acquainted with those of other nationalities and races. Such experiences suggest that human nature is much the same throughout the world. Some peoples are differently situated from others, and consequently have different reactions. But if history is studied impartially it appears that similar circumstances tend to produce similar action, irrespective of race or nationality. We cannot explain foreign acts which we do not like by the simple expedient of saying that the foreign people is "possessed of a devil." Nor can we intelligently appraise any people as consistently righteous or having a monopoly of the virtues. (p.61)

During times of tranquility it is possible for a substantial minority to indulge in such detached and philosophical judgments. But it is different when excitement runs high and when there is a real need for impartiality and for judgment which is penetrating and calm. Then the individual judgment is usually overpowered by the almost irresistible influence of mass emotion--an irresistibility which may not be readily explicable but which cannot be denied as a fact. (p. 61)

If the nation-hero and nation-villain portrayals are readily accepted because they respond to a basic human craving, this is not to say that they are self-created or self-operating concepts. There must be those who set the stage and arrange the lines of the drama. (p. 61)

The authors and stage-hands today are primarily those who compose the group authority. They lend themselves to this task of melodrama partly in good faith in order to create greater national unity and effectiveness and partly out of a desire, more or less conscious, thereby to enhance and perpetuate their own power. (p. 62)

The more critical the international situation is made to appear, the greater power will the group members give to their authority. The easiest and quickest cure of internal dissension is to portray danger from abroad. Thus group authorities find it convenient always to keep alive among the group members a feeling that their nation is in danger from one or another of the national-villains with which it is surrounded (p. 63)

In their efforts, the group authorities can count upon reinforcement from many private agencies which are engaged in catering to the emotional cravings of the masses. The financial success of such enterprise depends upon purveying shock and excitement. They are alert to pick up any suggestion of external danger or external villainy. By printed word or by pictures selected to produce an emotional reaction, they magnify incidents out of all relation to their actual importance and they induce unreliable generalizations. (p. 63)