S. C. Walter

I am going to talk about political extremism in American politics at the present time. There is really nothing new about it, because it a wery old disease in politics. What we have now 🖚 is just a new 🦚 As a disease of political discussion, perhaps one cannot really call it political debate, it is the use of bitter words, violent language, epithets to describe our It is mostly used today by people who do not like opponents. conservatives of any kind, but use attack was the ones they believe are on the extreme right. Thus, the "extreme right" responds with its own version of hostil language, and the wast mass of people who are in a kind middle are just the potter, So far no great damage has been done to the kind of democratic procedures we use, but violent and intemperate language can lead to Wiolent and intemperate action, which is contrary to the settlement of political questions by peaceful means. I want to make it clear there is extremism on both sides of the present-day political debate between liberals and conservatives, but it is clear, I think, that most liberals and most conservatives are quite patriotac and well-intentioned people. is a through the lasting division between people in any society betweenx on the question of being liberals and conservatives. Always it seems, some people are liberals and some are conservatives and an a democracy they usually compromise their differences as least after

It is apparent when in the debates today over liberalism and conservation, over the question of communism in America and in other countries, over the issue of the John Birch Society, and over some other items of no little importance, that people do not understand each other's positions. In a democracy

the answer that is commonly given is: let us educate people in their political thinking so that they will understand what wkkexx their political opponents really mean. Such education is not exactly easy even though the content of political debate is rather thin. Epithet and the abuse of one's enemies is a form of propaganda as well as being a form of slander. F.M. Xwxxxxx the great English Glassical scholar, onee remarked that propaganda was the art by which we almost xxxix deceive our friends while at the same time we do not quite deceive our marianax manies. Persons who do not want to understand xx those who are their opposites in political discussion can refuse to be educated any other level than by the use of axak extremist language. Even with the best of intentiors it is not always saxy, because the reports of the national breadcasting companies are highly selected, in order it would seem to encourage who hostitlity toward those who are considered to be extremists. Documentary reports on televsion are generally eg selected to give the liberals the best of it and the extremists the worst of it. Conservatives insist that most of the correspondents, whether they are in the news services or in the mass media, radio and telev ison are so liberal that they cannot really be fair or objective in their reports. It is noticeaxble that they seldom present as conservatives xxxxx Representatives and Senators, except Senator Barry Goldwater of Arizona, who is, of course, the leading KNNX Congressional conservative today. Text of is also noticeable that intellectuals and writers in the conservative field are not often used only the more controversial and perhaps the less intelligent members of the right wing in politics. To present only those who are not

the most effective spokesmen of the "cause" distorts the television documentary. It makes it harder to engage in relaxed discussion that might lead to greater political understanding. And it reduces the value of radio and television, and mewspapers, in informing the American people about the political arguments of our time.

there are explanations of why there is extremism inx on both of the outside wings of liberalism and conservatism. There was another time of violent, virulent discussion during the 1930s, in the years just before the outbreak of World War II in 1939. Indeed, the angry charges hurled back and forth today sound much like the Aimilar Charges so Com twenty-five years There seems to be a kind recurrence in political anger and political extremisms in rest other times and in other countries, but in the United States these intense period of political controversy occur just as in other societies, canadially those in Western Europe where we would expect people to be more civilized. Still, one thing should be noted the political leaders of today who are engaging in extremist argument and in extremist movements, and those who denounce them with passion and energy first their politics in the savage times of the 1930s. Adults today are the product of another time of extremism, when the fight of over fascism and communism first became active in America. became sensitive in the revolutionary period that led directly into World War II. Because they learned to chew politics inx thirty years ago they are no about inclined to spit it A revolutionary age is no time calmness, because out today. a revolutionary age involves nearly every one, and the duty on the citizen to seek political enlightenment is all the harder than it would in a period of stability in civilized states.

Our revolutionary age began in August, 1914, when kike World war I began, and it has continued every since. It some ways it has been a half century of economic madaless, and a time of little or no moderation in the human spirit. In the time of the chilosophers of Greece and Rome, one of the things they most highly prized in a citizen was his sense of moderation. Moderation was one of the highest of political virtues. It was an important element in political wisdom. But in Western Europe, in Latin America, and in the United States there have been long periods when there was no moderation in the political behavior of large numbers of the citizens. With the great economic depression in the United States, which began in 1929, there was fear and anger in Henty. All our institutions seemed to wobble, and Communist revolutionaries confidentily predicted the early achievement of a Soviet America. Many thought capitalism, that is, the free market system of economic competition was a thing of the past. DIEC EI VEI TOO, As the communists began to praise their economic planning, many said to be that planning in the United States would also cure our economic sickness. communist system was spreading here and there in the world; we have more and more people the true filled with feet began either to

7

Mussolini had come into power in Italy in 1922, but years later in January, 1953, when Hitler took over the government of Germany it made Mussolini far more of a danger to the Western world than he had been before. The fascist dictators seemed to be taking the world where the communist dictators had not. And in the crisis all of them, communist and fascist, seemed more evil than they had seemed when they were considered by the selves.

accept it or to fear it.

on top of this, from 1936 to 1939 there was a civil war in Spain,

Finally, the great of ock of all to the mind of the modern citizen was World War II, which lasted six long years, from 1939 to 1945. No one can count its cost in money and the destruction of property, no one can count its cost in lives to lost and dislocated people. To one can count its cost in the erosion of the human spirit, its destruction of justice and friendship throughout the world. At the end of that war proud empires had fallen, whole economic systems had been destroyed, and much of the political ideology the solutions to economic questions, which had seemed to fine before the war, proud empires and ineffective. Before the war there had been much confidence in what we called parliamentary government, for we thought it could

war.

he restored to the condition it was before fascism came on the scene in Italy and Germany. But somehow after the war the democratic system did not seem to catch, simply because men were too proccupied with their own troubles to care. The economic systems were slow in getting started again, though it seemed that those

covernments which allowed the free parket to function

moved shead faster than those which were socialistic in their manner of operation. Moreover, what had once been called democratic socialism to distinguish it from the socialism of the Soviet system, from the communist governments, were being applied in exhausted and sick societies, were as Great Britain. Some countries like Sweden that had not been in the war, seemed to continue their middle way between socialism and capitalism, but whatever the economic system might be in such a country it had not invaded like

Horway and it had, indeed, had a good period of busines during the

In a rather brief way, this is the political heritage of the American citizen in the last seventeen years since the end of the World War in 1945. The batreds of that war did not die, and the advocates of fascism and communism continued to seek an audience. But it was the communist system that spread throughout the world after the war. Some say that there were sympathizers with communism in the American government who helped out, especially by refusing to send aid to anti-communists like the Chinese Republic. The communists thus took over China in 1949, and the former Chinese republic moved to Formosa where it still is. When the war ended there were a 180,000,000 people under communist rule and now there are nearly 900,000,000; nearly a fourth of the surface of the earth is ruled by communist parties, by men who profess to believe in the materialism and the atheism of the communist system.

While fascist movements are not dead, they do not make now excend. What we have instead is the government of strong men who have virtually replaced Parliament, such as General Charles de Gaulle in France. The world, it is said, is a good place for colonels and generals; it is a good time for strong men with military rank. So while some fear the rise of fascism in America, as some who thought Senator Joseph R. McCarthy was a potential dictator, most would say the danger is the terrible spread of communism throughout the world, in the latest the strong men with military rank.

Wo wonder then there is newous tension, and great anxiety among Americans who are interested in politics. The "cold war" between the United States and it allies and the Russians and their allies, with the xx so-called "neutral countries" usually siding with the communists, goes on and on. Some begin to feel a quiet desperation that we win ita; others feel a noisy desperation that must we do something about it. And then the space age seems to dwarf the Little things we hold dear, such as our families, our religion, our professions, and our ideals. When brave wen oribiting about space with incredible power thrusting them on, it is diffizeult for some to feel that liberty has much meaning. But others say in anguish that unless we win the cold war all of this vast power will fall the direction and control of the communists, and everything we hold dear will be swept into the grbage can of near-forgotten history. Its it any wonder there is extremism? Is it any wonder that calmness and steely nerves in a time of troubles are more necessary than they have ever been for Americans, who have so many things so easily in the past?

But let us be a more s'ecific. That people have been excited about recently is the John Birch Society, and some of the other less prominent citizen organizations whose purpose is to fight communism both in the United States and abroad. There are many patrictic societies whose purpose is the defense of Americanism and throwever resistance to the growth of communist -- and nearcommunist ideas -- in this country. It is the "near communist ideas," of course, that causes all of the trouble, for there is little or no debate about those who are known in the tress as communists, where those who write for communist journals, or those whose names appear frequently on the lists of supporters of communist fronts. The category of communist that causes the most difficulty is what the communist call being "under discipline", though hay not be members of the party or of front organizations. Those under discipline may be teachers or members of the civil service, or members of some of the professions. and the intensity of the issurely deco. There may be as many as 800 cr a 1,000 patriotic organizations but they all want the hidden communist, the cryptocommunist, the 🙀 person not a member of the party who is under discipline, or just the person whose intellectual sympathy is for the communist world socialist system. Some of the harsher minds problem call the secret or pratical and effective sympath er with communism the "comsymp" which is surely an inelegant contraction of an equally clumsy

How a strange thing happened in 1961. All of a sudden the big guns were opened on the "Radical Right", the extremists, and indeed those who are articulate in leading the population toward a vigorous hostility toward communism. Just why this campaign was opened

name "the communist sympathyzer."

is not certain, but my own conviction is that many of the people in Washington became frightened that the conservative movement in the United States would really get together and become an effective political force against the liberal trends in politics. Congressional spokesman of the conservatives is now Senator Barry Goldwater of Arizona, and his little paperback book "The Conscience of a Conservative" has sold over a million copies. I think they were getting scared that Coldwater would really make the grade politically and throw some of the Liberal intellectuals out of Mashington. While Goldwater has been attacked, the attack on conservatives, the right wing, and the anticommunist people has centered on those with the least power and the least intellectual They do not use the members of the Congress or the effective writers conservative but rather those with little education, who are obvioulsy not intellectuals or speakers, and more particularly those who may have extreme ideas right field.

It seems that much of the violent discussion, extremist discussion of the discussion

into our public documents the records of the communist infiltrators in government, the armed services, in education, and in their general effectiveness in the field of spying. The governmental secrets of the United States. What Benator McCarthy wanted done is, I think, being done by these two committees today, and by the security program against communists in government. McCarthy's program did not die it merely took a new form and it is apparently effective today in checking communist infiltration and espionage in the United States.

after seven years of mux all quiet on the communist and conservative front, the new battle has begun again. The fat that Senator Goldwater has succeeded Senator Robert A. Taft of Chio as the leading Congressional conservative enough to the new violence of language and the violence of charges of pro-communist sympathy in the government. It began again with the San Francisco hearings of the House Un-American Activities Committee May, 1960. Students from the uxxx University of California and members of the longshoremen's union, along with some of the recognized leaders of the Communist Farty in Waxidania Californnia caused such an uproar that the hearings where hardly effective as an exposed of communism in northern (California. The House Committee Exhaustral issued subpoenas to get the news fixes of the three days of most unusual activity, and with comments by members of the House Committee they issued a film called "Operation Abolition." Hillions of people have seen it and millions of words have been issued in denunciation of it. In spite of all the criticism of detail in the ft. -- there is one case in which there is a reversal of sequente of events -is not denied that something teck place, indeed, that there something very much like a riot or mob action.

11

is it denied that any students, misled by agitators on the University of California campus, took part in what amounted to stopping the activity of a lawful part of the Congress of the United States.

A number of other events took place. In the spring of 1960 there occurred the massive attack on General Walker because of his program of anti-communist instruction of the tropps 🙀 under his command in West Germany. Eventually, instead of taking a command post in Hawaii, he resigned from the service xxx and is now making speeches to large audiences about the country on this issue, and also he is running for Fovernor of Tenas. Schebor Full might's a monrudum divocating the restriction of speeches on policy by military officers was a follow up on the Walker affair. ned on Robert Welch and the John Eirch Society. Les of Tulchelous desilon sile son properties for Dany years, and Lean accure you that seeding the Congressional ecord is hard on the eyes. During 1961 the psychologists got into the act, saying that the American people were showing signs the James or finit of the offe of abnormality, perhaps a little schizophrenia, and perhaps there was developing a victor fear of persecution a paranoid feeling on the part of the citizens who were concerned about communism within the country. In the meantime there developed immensely successful popular "schools" against communism, and one of the most successful of television programs of 1961 was the broadcast of the anti-communist schools nder orders from the President military officers were forbidden to take part in the anticommunist schools and seminars, and I understand they have been held recently on fewer occasions than in the past. And early in 1962 a campaign, which included conservatives, such as the

editors of the <u>Mational Review</u>, edited by William

Consorm of propries of president Remarked point to the

Buckely, Jr., and Senator Goldwater, urging Robert Welch to resign from the leadership of the John Birch Society, sim ly because his extremist view dividing conservatives and hurting the anti-communist cause in the United States.

It seems to me that much nonsense has been uttered and printed about the John Birch Society. Granting that Welch's ideas expressed in his 1955 private letter, "The Politician" which is no longer in circulation, are hardly to be defended, still what the Birchers do is to talk, and we are supposed to believe in free speech in the United States. I am not in favor of suppressing mere talk, I am in favor insisting that when a national broadcasting chain supposedly gives an impartial documentary presentation of the Right in America they be forced to desist from crass distortion and propaganda. ** I think Senator Goldwater's position is very godd and quite defensible, a position which he has presented in numerous television appearances: Mr. Welch should withdraw from the John Birch Society because he is neither intellectually nor emotionally suited to the dicriminating leadership of a free and effective anti-communist movement, and the upon such a resignation the more sober and patriotic Americans who compose the society could then engage in their civic work against communism. Still, if Mr. Welch does not wish to resign I can hardly agree that any censorship or suppression of him should occur, and I would say that those who are members of the society surely have the right to withdraw from nciety or to remain in as they may wish.

The presumption must be in favor of free speech, but there are many instances in which we restrict the circulation printed matter and freedom of speech on the media of mass communication.

One thing seems clear: every citizen must be concerned with the

security of his country. We should not be ashamed of patriotism though patriots may be misguided at times, so may those who some times laugh at the Daughters of the American revolution or who get high blood pressure over the John Birch Society, the Ainutemen (with about 800 members) or a whole variety of other types of patriotic activity. Both patriots and their critics can be wednesd extremists, but we believe in our democracy that process of public discussion will bring to victory a more moderate position. We hope in the end the truth, or something that may be very close to the ounselves is whether communism within the United States is a menace, we all recognize that internationally it is, for in any Cuba and the fact that the end of February one heard over the radio wat we had 4,000 American krops It is another way, another Korea on a small scale. in Viet Wam. Domestically we must ask whether those who are "soft" communism are endangering the defense of our country, when the soft ones are in positions of pager in Washington. It is surely not extreme to continue a vigorous security program to exclude from governmental positions public officials whose softness borders on positive sympathy for the communist cause. The security risk should not be allowed in government.

Now the issue seems to be something like this. The government obviously does not want the average citizen to be too interested in the effort to protect the United States from communist infiltration. When the average citizen gets interested he is likely to agree with President Robert Morris of the University of Dallas who wrote a book about the cold war and domestic communism with the title "Mo Wonder We Are Losing." Obviously, too, the citizen should not be an extremist; he should discriminating and moderate in his

Political views and in his activities. He should respect the civil rights of all persons, and any suggestion of fascist racism, anti-semitism, for example, must be thrust aside. But the communist is a revolutionary trying to over throw the government of the United States, its political system, xndx the economic system and the rights of property of all Americans. We must be moderate but determined, and one thing that disoncerts a lot of those who are soft on communism is this very determinism of the people to organize and to express their feelings on so important and issue. The right to organize must extend to those who are fearful of communist infiltration as well as those who are not. Many politicians, of course, are running the other way; they want ₩ neither extremists of the right nor of the left, and above all they do not want to be pinned down with bitizens organized and studying the communist question in the America assiust are it likely to pin the politicians down. Patriots on the war path do not want any "compromising statesmen" around to confuse the issue. Difficult political issues are never easy to solve, and it seems clear that what we must do about communism and our natural security as great issues will last a lot longer than political extremism. The right and the left will organize and reorganize many times before the world ceases to be anxious about the challenge of international communism.

Let us now turn to the question of civil liberty in more detail than we have spoken of it before. I do not think we can doubt that many of those who criticize what they call the political extremists are genuinely afraid that they are seeking to destroy civil liberty. I know some seople who believe the John Birch Society is trying to set up a dictatorship in America; and I know at least one person who believes that General Walker is trying to be the Hitler of America and that defenders of civil liberty may neet their death just because they believe in the American democratic tradition. I mow another person who believes that any effort to engage William Xuxxxxx Buckley or an editor of the <u>Mational Neview</u> as a lecturer is part of a widespread conspiracy to overthrow American liberty. The people, and a lot like them, believe that any Wisconstitutes, communism is really a cover-up for an attack on the American political system. They will say that the defenders of the Right should not even be allowed to debate the left in public on a college campus or in a public xxxixx auditorium. How I think this is all very unhealthy, and I believe there must be a lot of maladjusted beople on both sides of the fence these days. As Clinton Rossier has said there are adjusted people in politics, unadjusted people, and maladjusted people. But it works both ways, for conservatives and liberals have to make some kind of adjustment with the people who oppose them in politics. The adjusted liberal or conservative is one who bends and swings along with the tide of those things are clearly not practical politics

to reverse what has been done. The unadjusted liberal or conservative is the fighting the current fight over a given political proposal, and perhaps the maladjusted one is the victim of dark and unrealistic fears for the future. He may be so fearful

of the future that he actually a revolutionary.

We Americans are proud of tradition of civil liberty. xxxxx Civil liberty is composed of the rights in the bills of rights. The de rights are not fundamental because they are in the state and national constitutions; they were put in the constitutions because they were fundamental before they became the supreme law of the land, as we say of our national Constitution. These rights are our natural rights that form part of the wow of nature; they limit the government, and by law the governments have limited individuals from injuring each other in the violation of them. wost of these rights really guarantee us due process of law; they guarantee us against arbitrary arrest and they provide us with all sorts of protections against unfair trials. We have most of xxixx civil liberty to cate the second of a fair and impartial trial a for the protection of our life, liberty, and property. Lowever, in the discussion of "extremism" the civil liberties that seem the most important are those which relate to freedom of speech, freedom of the Press, and the freedoms of assembly and setition. When we extend tolerance to some one with whom we agree, it costs us very little in nervous energy to ake such a decasion. But when we tolerate some one with whom we disagree then it is a serious matter. In a democracy the problem of the public discussion of politics is generally of this nature, for it is a question of tolerating those we down not like we we we at comes to the question of whether decrees stould expector the test that expector or whether the members of the John Birch Society should be put in their place, the it takes real tolerance and real tolerance this is precisely what we have undertaken do under our constitutional system, in which the

Constitution is the supreme law of the land and the gudges are cledged to maintain it and enforce it.

But no liberty is without limitations, and no li itation in a free society wix is without some public official to interpret it and to enforce it. In war time the limitations on freedom are indeed extreme, since the limitations imposed are dictated by the needs of the govern ont in winning the war. It is the President using what are called executive orders who determines in general what the limits on freedom shall be, and the courts the limits on government to be practically cease to found in the bill of rights. We all seem to recornize the justice of restricting freedom during war, but it is in time of peace that we differ, and quite become violent in our judgment of any limitations. For the most part we will all accept the limitiation on limitiation on limitiation of limitiation of the young ... We do not permit obscene literature to be sold, and it is heavily restricted on television and on the radio, as well asin newspapers. However, the wink novelist is permitted to say nearly anything he wants to say, and there is no restriction on his liberty as a writer. To issue of political extremism arises in these situations; it is only in the political area and more precisely on communism that the charge of extremism is made, and the counter-change that some one is really a secret communist or secretly working for the success of the communists.

publicity on two matters. One, his long letter "The Politician" to Eisenhower as a military man as at President, and it points, out the great extent of communist expansion in the world under President Eisenhower. But Mr. Welch has also demanded that Chief

Justice Warren be impeached for overturning in reality the teaning of the Constitution. Both of these xxxxxxx propositions have been considered by mostle becole as absurd, and they have been the main bases on which the Birch Society has failed to commend itself to Carine easingly large to the Arerican teople. In addition, Mr. Welch has been a poor public relations can for himself, since in various of his public appearances he shown an unsophisticated anger at questioners and at the press and television I know of one case in which he axx is reported to have stormily left the hall in the midst of efforts to ask questions which would be considered relevant indeed to the question of whether or not the John Birch Society deserves the support of American citizens. shout charge and the transitive to efficients, of is clear that fixxity much of the meaning of civil libertly rests in the hands of the federal courts. On xxxx serious questions, in which some issue of the interpretation of the Constitution is raised, it is of course the Surpeme Court which Mothe final right to say what the Constitution means. On the other hand, the Congress, the Fresident, and Lany civil servants, such as the lawyers in the Department of Justice, have much to say as to the meaning of our civil liberties. No matter what one's position is the Court is not always with wa, and it is not always against So etimes the Court seems to have a slight majority in fafor of a very wide interpretation of private right against the government, and some times the reverse is true. Just now in 1962 there there seems to be 5 to 4 majority in favor of sustaining the rights of the government to protect the country against the secrecy and the infiltration of communists. Liberals seem much disturbed at

this, but not laxxx many years ago it was the conservatives who

believed the Supreme Court was so sensitive to the rights of communists that the judges were endagering the safety of the United States. it is the President and a few Senators who are most ammious to protect those accused of being subversives in the government, or in any kind of www.xx secret, scientific and manufacturing work for the defense of the country. The Communist $m{\mathcal{P}}$ arty has been declared illegal by act of Congress and the Surveme Court has sustained this law; members of the party and the party are required by law to register as foreign agents, but the Department of Justice has been slow in enforcing the law. the actual civil rights of members of the communist farty have not been deriously restricted, even though the Congress and the Courts have declared that they should be restricted. But we will continue, point by point, and case by gase, to define the In war we will put them all -civil liberty of the communist. all we can get -- behind bars, but in peace we will move slowly because of our respect for our tradition of the civil liberty of the citizen. As long as the cold war continues, as long as Russia and the Water Communist-blog countries are dedicated to the everthrow of the United States, this cautious and hesitant judgment of the communist under the Constitution will continue. Let us hope that the mistakes that made and the errors of judgment of our public officials are not serious.

One thing the Supreme Court has sustained is the right of the investigating committees of Congress to subpoena witnesses and ask them under oath and pain of perjury whether they are communists and who are the communists they know. Liberals have regarded this as a form of extremism, but since the Court sustains it I suppose would have to say it can hardly be called extremism. The right to investigate is a very ancient right of legislative bodies it

existence of the legislature. It originated in the middle ages, and we have taken it from the British Parliament, but every legislistative body in the world where there is freedom to enact laws has the right to investigate in order ultimately to propose constitutional amendments or legislation, or otherwise to hold executive officials responsible for the charges laid on them by the elected representatives of the people. It around 1939 under the Dies Committee Congress has investigated communists and their activity in the United States, and it seems it is continuing to do so, though the investigating committees no longer the publicity that Senator EcCarthy's committee on government operations was given in

This is what happens. The investigators for xx the Senate Internal Security Committee or for the House Committee on Un-American Acitivites water oath testimony that some one in ... government, education, or military work is a communist. This person is subpoenad to come before the committee. Under eath and under penalty of serjury he is asked: Were you a Communist at a certain time, or did you know such and such a person at a given The witness, accompanied by his attorney though the committee is not at all a court or even like one, may say: I refuse to answer under the Fifth Amendment because a truthful answer might tend to The witness has right, but does the John Birch incriminate / e. Society, or indeed most Americans, then have the right to EXXXXXXX conclude that such a witness is really a communist? Suppose the witness is asked whether he has engaged in spying against the United States and he refuses to answer, are we justified in saying that he is probably a spy? And support under the freedom of

speech clause in the First Amendment the witness says that his political convictions are his own business even though he might be a communist, and the committee cites him for contempt of Congress, is this a violation of civil right? Is this political extremism on the parta of the House or Senate committees? Does one have the right to say his political and other convictions are his own and nobody has a right to ask him what they are? At the same time does he have a right to demand a job in a an educational institution, in the government as a civil servant, www or as an employee of a company developing rockets for our space program. Is it extremeism to demand a statement of convictions? The liberals say it is; and that it certainly andangers our liberty; but the anti-communist says that one may not hide the crime of conspiracy to everthrow the government, and being a communist is in effect being a conspirator against the safety of the country. The conservative were will say that the extremist is the liberal who by his tenderness, no doubt in many instances a sincere tenderness for the conscience of the rebel against society, is really underming the security of the United States.

A final comment on this particular issue. Under our tradition of civil liberty it would seem that we cannot suppress political extreme and irresponsible extreme and responsible extreme and probable of the view that one has the right to express philosophical and speculative opinions and likewise we can judge the action of the public official. But we can and do say that action, the deed, the crime, which is a violation of the law, and which endangers the security of the nation can and must be suppressed. To engage in comparacy is not a civil right.

In the final section of this lecture I want to comment on ca: liberals frequently charge conservatives with being extremists, and conservatives frequently charge liberals with artranists in that they are said to be dangerous to the national tradition, to the American tradition. It is a battle in one sense to interpret our tradition. It is a battle between the new conservatives as they are often called, and the old liberals who say they represent the comtinuties of our rational life. Now we must admit, I think, that there really are extremists and that extremists of whatever kind do in fact endanger the success of our system of government under the Constitution. It is not enough simply to say that if one is not violating the law there is nothing to worry. The law, t at is, the criminal law, does not is not covered by any law. It is customary behavior, and traditional values or judgments about what one ought to do. Tradition is not just habitual behavior; it is a judg ent of what is true and false and what one ought to do or ought not to do. Tradition embresses general agreement or consensus between citizens. What ever broadens this consensus is useful to democracy, and whatever seems to break people into warring groups or classes in conflict as the Communists advocate as the chief political fact, is dangerous. It is extremism in its ordinary and oractical form.

But remember that political difference and political conflict is itself part of our consensus, and there is nothing unhealthy about the conflict of the candidates of different political parties seeking to be nominated and elected. In any time of leace and security most people tend toward the middle toward moderation.

There is less difference between dex Democrate and Republicans

near the middle of the political scale than $_{\mathbf{A}}$ is between these Democrats and Republicans near the stremes of either party. The extremes by definition signify a break in the chain of consensus that binds the people of a nation together. ost of our political decisions are really compromises which permit us all to make honorable adjustments to what the government has decided. This is the ideal, and in a functioning working denocracy it is generally true, since people are loyal to the govern ent -ë they are not conspirators or revolutionaries -- executives and they accept the decisions lawfully made by Exxxidenix, legislatures and courts. But where the communist class war has taken root there seems to be no solution. In the conflicts between groups and class violence and death begins to be the order of the , and opposition is considered to be traitors ex their liberty is destroyed. Their religion is suppressed; their life liberty and property is often ruthlessly taken away. Democracy and were republican government are quite impossible under these conditions.

Democracy thrives on intelligent public discussion and on intelligent differences of opinion about public issues. In our society liberals and conservatives near the middle -- and most of us really are near the middle -- will differ sharply on many things, but neither will be extremists. The conservatives are divided between those who reer communist is the greatest enemy and those who feel that the vast growth of the power of the state is our greatest enemy. Liberals are divided between those who most of all want to bring about what used to be called democratic socialism, collectivism and the great growth of the so-called welfare state, and those liberals who will accept the idea of a free and competitive market as the governor of the economy and

some regulation of business but who are most of all concerned with the protection of civil liberty, the liberties of speech, religion, and press listed in the state bills of rights and in the Amendents to the national Constitution. The political continues always on these, but there is another issue that seems to override them: that is national security, though most every one will accept strong military preparation for the armed defense of the country liberals tend to favor the United Nations, come what may, and lots of foreign aid, especially to the so-called under-developed countries. Conservatives are increasingly critical of them what they consider the reckless spending of the than ayers money fattens in foreign aid that the private purses of the educated ruling politicians. They are unimpressed, for example, with the United Kations war in the Congro and the effert to get the United States to buy bonds of the UN because other countries will not pay up what is due. But there are the margins; we there liberal Republicans and conservative Democrats, and it is often true that the vote in Congress over a single bill or resolution is not governed by party affiliation at all.

Eroadly, then, a conservative is to be defined as a follower of Aristotle in philosophy, who is probably a Christian or a religious man, who wants a free market and capitalist economy, but who will modify the free economy as far as is necessary to attain national military and diplomatic security. A liberal is more or less the opposite, eccept on national security. A liberal is general one who is not concerned about religion and who is a believer in scientific philosophy; he accepts the welfare state with extensive social legislation; and he will either favor economic collectivism or the extensive regulation of business.

By proposition here is that none of these people is to be considered an exrem, for they all fit into the many- colored politics of a republic and a democracy. These differences of opinion, reflected in political party programs and in political campaigns, are the normal substance of politics, whatever may be one's personal convictions. Such political controversy is not dangerous to our institutions, or to the political system organized under the Constitution. It is assumed that all, will abide by the decisions of government, by elections much strain when elections are stolen, and there does not seem to be anywaxx way by which a democracy can recover a stolen election. When elections are bought it is immoral, but it is also one of the most dangerous forms of political extremism. The local boss boys votes and sells favors, and of the corruption of big city politics there seems to be no end. But after this the political parties and the politicians cease to have the will to govern with responsibility, and the political leader is corrupted by the They both the public interest for sale, corrupted voter. and they both are preparation for the revolution and civil war.

Mow I have said several times the there is extremism on both ends of the political spectrum. Not long ago I read a column by one of our liberal columnists. He began by talking about conservatives, next he spoke of Rixxxxx rightists, then ultra-rightists and

ultra-conservatives. After this he got down to the real business of the column. He spoke of prejudiced conservatives, some of whom he said are anti-xxx demitic, implying really that they all are. And at the very end of the commumn he began to speak of fascists, implying that conservatives in general are fascists. On the other hand, the extremist on the conservative side will talk about liberals as socialists, then they Expetaczmannistamem kiknatamenkihamenamumintamen soft on communists, religious, and finally liberals become identified with communists pure and simple. These ideas are what I meant by the extremism of both the right and the left. There are thousands of small organized political groups in the country, on both sides of the fence. Because a large percentage of those in education and in newspaper work are liberal, the conservative or rightist organizations get a lot more publicity than the organizations on the left. It is most diff cult to get beyind the facade of organization, and to find really what may be in the minds of those who are running it. Obviously, when there is a resort to violence such as the bombing of homes, putting bombs in automobiles, or throwing acid in the faces of those who are our enemies, we all agree this extremism. We never quite how many people really want to burn synagogues, Catholic Churches, or just any church We know these people are extremists and dangerous at the acso are fearful of those whose ideas are so extreme that more simpleminded people may be led to permorm wacts of revolutionary crime.

Education for democratic living is in part at least education in the avoidance of extremism in politics, or in anything exercise. But it is particularly education in the art of public discussion. Ever since Exercise Plato, there have been rules for this. One must try to listen to and repspect the right of another

to hold and to express opinions on political questions. As Plato said, no one must skander another, either personally or through his beliefs. I suppose we have no obligation to listen to a political agitator of any kind. We have a democratic right to xxix silence, something that the totalitarian government will not recognize. XXXXXXX But we are committed to the constitutional manner of making decisions, that is by elections, by out right to articipate in politics, or to run for office. We are committed against crime and revolution. We can write letters to public men, and when these letters show personal thought and care they are tremendously effective on the mind of the political leader. We can support lobbyists who argue our cause before those who are in public office. We may lobby before administrative departments of the government as well as before the law-maker. But those in government are not stupid, and they know a lot. you lobby and have no basis in $information_{\pmb{\lambda}}$ you are likely to Wish you had stayed home. A letter may empose your ignrorance but it will not expose war you to public humiliation. important that we support the partisan press we believe in, since the big newspapers and the radio and television is generally bland, or subtly in favor of what the government is actually doing. We do not have read the writings of the zww columnist whom we consider foolish, or one who had had the honor of being called a liar by a President of the United States.

Still, there is another thing. Education for citizenship must not be propaganda. It should be directed to the understanding of issues, it should be directed kaxakkx toward the objective of getting more and more information about issues. The unfounded charge must be rejected, because the "Kbig lie" is one of the

standard techniques of the extremist and the irresponsible.

Perhaps we should respect ourselves as citizens of a democracy, and include in that self-respect the obligation to engage in intelligent public discussion.