to guarantee to discussion of such conditions the freedom that it allows to more obviously "patriotic" discussion.

Such critical remarks may seem ungracious, in view of all the wisdom this reviewer finds in the book, especially in its discussion of the role of government and the importance of making it responsive to an informed public opinion. The criticism is in fact suggested by Lasswell's own discussion of "U. S. Assets in the War of Ideas" (p. 19). We are still, he says, the "miracle" of our age, in virtue of our standard of living, generally diffused, of the "new birth of personal dignity" which millions have found here, of our continued efforts to reduce the gap between theory and practice in respect to human personality. We are shocked to "hear ourselves denounced as the spearhead of all that is old, rotten and corrupt." We are not happy to be "the power that props up what is left of the empires of Europe in Asia, Africa and the islands." But the implication is surely not that we should merely build our walls and hug to ourselves our miraculous dignity and standard of living. The pursuit of individual freedom has in it the paradox that it is both the most significant ingredient in our national strength and at the same time a principle by which we affirm our participation in the larger human enterprise. Professor Lasswell is far from affirming that we can be free only by keeping aloof. But he does not explore the ways in which Americans can associate with other freedom-loving peoples to make the cause of freedom more secure. "The reincorporation of everyone into the commonwealth is," he says, "a pressing problem of modern society." The civil liberties are America's especial instrument for incorporation of all men in that international commonwealth now struggling to be born.

DONALD MEIKLEJOHN


In Witch Hunt Mr. McWilliams is indirectly concerned with the theme of this symposium. Congressional investigations are discussed briefly, and only as they are symptomatic of the state of mind which produces investigations of loyalty by administrative tribunals, state legislatures, and university trustees and faculties. Indeed, he claims that by ordering an administrative investigation of the loyalty of federal employees President Truman "cynically touched off the worst witch hunt in the last quarter century" (p. 7) and asserts that "McCarthyism is a direct outgrowth of the President's loyalty program" (p. 16).

The author is not, however, concerned with extensive discussion of the legal and constitutional questions raised by loyalty investigations. Although these questions are real enough, they obscure more fundamental issues, for concentration on individual rights overlooks "social freedoms" and the functions which individuals and groups perform through the exercise of their rights in a free society. Certain legal premises or conclusions are nevertheless set forth. Freedom
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of speech is absolute: "The guarantee of free speech, which for the first time in
history found formal sanction in the First Amendment, is wholly, and inten-
tionally, unequivocal. It was intended to mean precisely what the amendment
states, namely, that Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech" (p. 290). All difficulties are solved if freedom of speech means "freedom
of speech" and whatever abridges it "abridges" it. (Or are they?) From this
premise it follows that the "clear and present danger" standard is simply a
device to permit and to rationalize violations of the First Amendment. Spe-
cifically, congressional and other investigating committees have no right to in-
quire either into a person's beliefs or his organizational membership. Loyalty
oaths are objectionable because logically they call for investigation of the truth-
fulness of the oath-taker (p. 31).

The real purpose of the author, however, does not concern a systematic his-
torical account of loyalty investigations nor a legal analysis. The book opens
and closes with a metaphor of the branches of the trees clashing together as a
storm sweeps the forest. It is the storm which must be explained. The causes of
the present concern over loyalty and communism manifested in oaths and in-
vestigations are analyzed on two levels—which may be termed sociological and
psychological.

Compendiously stated, the sociological analysis runs thus. A "self-evident"
premise holds that the increasingly monopolistic and dictatorial economy of the
United States is creating great personal insecurity and fear among us. The
resulting social tensions present a threat to the wealthy, powerful, and ruling
groups in the society. Consciously or unconsciously (which, is not made clear)
they react by demanding total conformity of political and economic opinion.
Loyalty investigations are used to stigmatize and punish the most conspicuous
challengers of the status quo. Larger groups of citizens who might be tempted to
criticism, particularly college professors, are driven by fear of loss of livelihood
or social status to conform and even to join in the witch hunt.

"Superficially the American obsession with loyalty appears to stem from the
facts and implications of the 'cold war' " (pp. 27–28) but it is clear to the author
that international tension influences but does not cause this obsession. Thus the
storm is not the ominous cloud of communist aggression that has already de-
scended upon Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, and that hovers even now
over Berlin, Vienna, Greece, and Korea. The storm is economic maladjustment
that threatens social disintegration within the United States.

The psychological analysis which runs through the book is more subtle, com-
plex, and harder to summarize. The acute insights into the state of mind both of
heretics and their inquisitors would be, for this reader, sharpened by less fre-
quent repetition of such psychological jargon as "obsessions," "illusions," "de-
lusions," "paranoia," "paranoid delusions," and "self-estrangement," and by
less extensive discussion of medieval witchcraft. A revealing contrast is drawn
between the heretic who rejects the dominant ideology but does not reject the
notion of dominant ideologies, and the dissenter who is a critic of all official
ideologies and of the principle of conformity. The differentiation presented between conformity resulting from fear, and unity which must rest upon loyalty whose essence "is consent freely given," is not new, but it is timely. Since both heretics and their persecutors are influenced less by logic and more by emotion than either realize, the punishment of heresy must result in hardening the intolerance of both accuser and accused. The great danger is that in a prolonged struggle between the heretics and the heresy hunters, who are similar in their inability to brook contradiction, moderate men will join one group or the other "not upon the basis of conviction or preference but simply because they fear or dislike one extreme more than the other" (p. 329).

Clearly Mr. McWilliams seeks to rally the moderates. The ultimate test of his book is the soundness of the method by which he attempts to do so. With moderates nothing succeeds like moderation. It is impossible for a believer in freedom of discussion to regard many of the stupid and foolish actions described in this book without feelings of revulsion and disgust, nor to see injustices already done without alarm at the prospect of further ones. But if he allows his analysis of the dangers and his prescriptions for their remedy to be dominated by these emotions he may disable his advocacy. Mr. McWilliams' definition of the cause of anti-communist hysteria in the United States is all too likely to lead many readers to close his book or at least close their minds even though they read farther. Since no author should be criticized for the book he did not write, the author of Witch Hunt is under no obligation to stress the real dangers of sabotage and espionage from fanatical adherents of communism. He need not even review the evidence that American Communists profit from the present hysteria because it spreads mutual distrust and hostility among loyal citizens. He might well note that many other writers have done all this. But when the significance of Russian aggression as a cause of many Americans' fears is not simply ignored but brusquely dismissed in favor of a vague stereotype of a ruling class which is determined to rob the people of their liberties and which for that purpose sets the government to waging "a curious psychological warfare ... against the people" (p. 28), one may ask if the author is not conjuring up a few witches himself. He reveals his own state of mind by describing in detail the corporate business affiliations of a board of trustees of a state university accused of violating academic freedom, as an example of the bias of those who control universities. Yet he praises the board of trustees of the University of Chicago for their stand in the Broyles investigation without noting that their corporate connections would make the other board look like very small businessmen indeed.

Fortunately one need not accept all of the author's premises nor all of his proposals—which seem to deny any place to security investigations—in order to find much of worth in his criticisms of what is being done. It is only fair to him to add that he would not demand that his readers do so.

Robert Horn
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