

MAY 12 1947
HOW TO MEASURE LOYALTY

Attorney General Clark is one of those responsible for carrying out the Presidential order to screen out of Federal employment persons associated with "totalitarian, Fascist, Communist or subversive" organizations. Such persons may not be reassured by Mr. Clark's statement in Boston Saturday that he planned no "witch hunts." Any activity that cramps their style is to them a witch hunt. But old-fashioned liberals may be encouraged.

Our loyalty laws and orders are only as good as the men who carry them out. In striking at abuses of freedom they could be dangerous to freedom itself. Between 1884 and 1939 it was illegal to require a civil service applicant to state his "political or religious views or affiliations." No such applicant need make a positive statement of his political views today. But he does have to state that his political views do not include "advocating the overthrow of our constitutional form of government," and he can be denied a post or discharged from one if there is "reasonable ground" to believe that he holds such views or belongs to an organization which supports them. The hitch comes in defining and recognizing these organizations. Our Communist fellow-citizens are clever in devising "fronts" for their peculiar purposes. Innocent people do sometimes get roped in. And persons not so innocent sometimes keep clear of all such admitted entanglements.

The screening operations will be elaborate and costly. They must deal with 2,100,000 present Federal employes and all replacements. They will be delicate, for we would be disloyal to democracy if we penalized people for their lawful opinions. Mr. Clark warned against "prejudice and bigotry," advocated better schools and asserted that our final defense "is to make the ideal of democracy a living fact." If our loyalty program sticks to these principles it will never be abused. They are themselves a measure of loyalty.

New York Times
Tyranny of Majority

IN the light of past and projected developments it does not require a prophet or the son of a prophet to realize that the time is not far distant when a great part of American education at the collegiate level will be in state or in federally subsidized private institutions. With that there can be no quarrel, since private endowment just cannot keep pace with the increasing demand for higher education. This thought seemed uppermost in the mind of President Harold W. Dodds of Princeton in his remarks at the inauguration of William Edwards Stevenson as eighth president of Oberlin College.

Dr. Dodds, while "not passing judgment on this trend," viewed America as "an increasingly collectivistic society" in which it is the duty of the independent college to maintain educational freedom. He said:

No society is truly free in which one authority makes and executes all the important decisions. This is true even when that authority is a representative assembly honestly reflecting the will of the majority. Surely we have seen enough in recent years to realize that the majority may be tyrannical.

The majority may not only be tyrannical, but it may also be wrong. At a lower educational level the Scopes "monkey trial" in Tennessee was about the nadir of governmental interference with education. It is nothing as bizarre as that about which Dr. Dodds is concerned, but he insisted:

The only way we can protect ourselves from slipping into a position in which the majority does our educational thinking for us is by maintaining in full and vigorous health the private college and university.

Dr. Dodds spoke, with "a profound respect for our tax-supported institutions," saying they and the independent institutions "make up our pattern of democratic education, which is unique in the world." That these public institutions are doing a great work is beyond dispute, but in some of them there is always the possibility that politics may override freedom.

Not in education alone, but also in other areas of life Dr. Dodds felt there should be "lively independent associations responsible to constituencies which represent less than a majority to combat trends with all their vigor if they believe it is necessary to do so." How else can majorities headed in the wrong direc-

tion be made to see the error of their ways?