Science and Freedom

ACADEMIC FREEDOM IN THE U.S.A.:

1. *ARTHUR SCHLESINGER, Jr.*
2. *GLENN R. MORROW*

THE DISAPPEARANCE OF PROFESSOR GALINDEZ

MANUEL DE IRUJO

SELF-GOVERNMENT IN AUSTRALIAN UNIVERSITIES

GEOFFREY SAWER

CO-EXISTENCE WITH SOVIET HISTORIANS

WALTHER HOFER

KRUSHCHEV AND THE "THAW"

GEORG VON RAUCH

A BULLETIN OF THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND FREEDOM.

No. 6

August, 1956.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE & FREEDOM

Sponsored by the Congress for Cultural Freedom

WITH THE COMPLIMENTS OF THE SECRETARY

LIME COTTAGE,
818, WILMSLOW ROAD,
DIDSBURY,
MANCHESTER, 20.

TELEPHONE
DIDsbury 5696

THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND FREEDOM . . .

. . . was established in July, 1954, under the auspices of the Congress for Cultural Freedom, a permanent organization with headquarters in Paris, to carry on the discussion of issues in the field of academic freedom which was begun at the Hamburg Congress of July, 1953. The Committee will seek to maintain contact with all who are interested in these issues and to prepare the way for a further Congress on Science and Freedom.

HONORARY SPONSORS:

Carlo Antoni
Percy W. Bridgman
Sir Henry Dale
James Franck
Romano Guardini
Otto Hahn
Karl Jaspers
Max von Laue
Jacques Maritain
Lise Meitner
H. J. Muller
Ernest Nagel
Robert Oppenheimer
Earl Russell
Bruno Snell
Sir George Thomson
Salvador de Madariaga

COMMITTEE:

Chairman :
Michael Polanyi

Raymond Aron
Enzo Boeri
A. Buzzati-Traverso
Cyril D. Darlington
Theodosius Dobzhansky
John C. Eccles
Walther Gerlach
Paul Gillis
Sidney Hook
Henri Janne
Taku Komai
Daniel Lagache
Helmuth Plessner
Eugene Rabinowitch
Edward Shils

Joint Secretaries : George and Priscilla Polanyi
Lime Cottage, 818 Wilmslow Road, Didsbury, Manchester 20, England.

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

Another crack has appeared in the monolithic structure of Soviet dictatorship. The Poznan rising of June 1956 will take its place in history after the 20th Party Congress, February 1956, and the Berlin rising, June 1953, as one more land-mark in the great surge forward from cold tyranny and cold war to a warmer climate, in which real living people rise up again and take their places in the drama that has for so long been played out by lifeless puppets. By their savage reprisals against this latest uprising the rulers of Poland have shown that they mean to preserve their authority and that freedom is to be had only at the pace and in the measure which they allow. But they dare not reverse the movement; the thaw is on, and the peoples of the world are not likely to be satisfied with some watered-down parody of freedom.

In this issue of the bulletin we survey, at either end of the ideological scale, movements of opinion that tend to liberate the human spirit. Professor Schlesinger's article bears witness to the strong revulsion that is taking place in the U.S.A., against the chauvinistic spy scare of the Korean war era and in favour of a reassertion of the free and independent status of the intellectual community. Professor Morrow describes the constitution and methods of working of the American Association of University Professors, whose report on academic freedom and tenure, published in the spring of this year, played a leading part in shaping opinion.

On the Soviet side, we have reports from Professors Hofer and von Rauch which clearly indicate the recent signs of relaxation in the Bolshevik system of " thought-control " and the new possibilities for contact with scholars in Soviet countries. Both authors emphasize however that there are, as yet, strict limitations to the community of ideas which we may expect to establish on the basis of such contacts. The new masters in the Kremlin have not become disciples of John Stuart Mill merely because they prefer to quote Lenin rather than Stalin.

The inner strength of the liberal system derives from our unrelenting efforts to reshape institutions in the light of current needs, while preserving intact traditional principles. The survey by Professor Geoffrey Sawer, of Canberra University, of the problems of self-government in Australian universities, together with his proposals for constitutional reform, give a lead in this direction. Equally important, though in a different sphere, is the sharp reminder contained in Senor Irujo's article, of the danger that threatens our society from the dictatorships which still survive outside the Soviet world. To be " non-communist " is not, after all, sufficient guarantee that one will observe the highest standards of intellectual freedom.

THE DISAPPEARANCE OF PROFESSOR GALINDEZ

by

MANUEL DE IRUJO

On March 12th 1956, a Basque professor named Galindez, teaching at Columbia University, New York, disappeared on his way home from the university. Sr. Manuel de Irujo, a former President of the Basque National Council and Minister in the Spanish Republican Government, describes the circumstances, and the evidence which points to those responsible for Galindez' disappearance.

Professor Galindez was born in Amurrio, in the Spanish Basque Country, in 1915. He attended the secondary school in Bilbao and studied for his law degree in Madrid.

At the outbreak of the civil war in July 1936, Galindez offered his services to the Basque authorities, and occupied successively the posts of Legal Attache to the Basque Delegation in Madrid, Legal Adviser to the General Administration of Prisons in Valencia, Officer of the Basque-Pyrenean Brigade in Catalonia, and Secretary Advocate of the High Court of the army in the East. In February 1939, after the defeat of the Spanish Republican army, he crossed over into France and was interned in a concentration camp. During the confusion caused by the advance of the German army in 1940 he managed to escape from France and found refuge in the Dominican Republic.

In the capital city of the Republic, he pursued his career as a writer, broadcaster, private tutor, teacher in the Diplomatic and Consular School, and Secretary to the Faculty of Comparative Latin-American Legislation in the University of Santo Domingo. Soon, however, Galindez' liberal outlook proved incompatible with the medieval despotism which prevails in the Dominican Republic. In 1946 he left to take up residence in New York, where in 1948 he was nominated Delegate of the Basque Government, the post he was occupying at the time of his disappearance.

Elected Auxiliary Professor of International Law in Columbia University, he attended the university both as teacher and student. On February 27th 1956, he presented his thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy and Political Sciences : *Trujillo's Dominican Republic.* On March 12th, after giving his class in the university, he stayed for a while discussing the day's work with the students. Then he left for his home, which he never reached.

His Work.

Galindez was a " Basque Nationalist Democrat." Broadly speaking this is equivalent to a " Christian Democrat." He was a regular contributor to most of the Basque journals and to many other newspapers and reviews published in various countries of the Western Hemisphere. Among his published works were the following: " Elements of Juridical Science," 1941 ; " The Basque Contribution to International Law," 1942 ; " Five Legends of the Tropics," which won the first prize in the literary competition to mark the centenary of the Dominican Republic, 1944 ; " Principal Conflicts in American Law," 1954. In 1955 he published, in New York, his text book on the constitutions of South America, " Ibero-America : her Political, Social, Economic, Cultural and International Evolution." This was his last published work before his disappearance and it was banned and withdrawn from circulation in several South American Republics governed by dictatorships.

As Delegate of the Basque Government, Galindez was registered in the U.S. State Department, to which he paid frequent visits. In this capacity he also acted as an accredited observer to the United Nations. By virtue of his background and character he came to be recognized as an intermediary between the various groups of South Americans resident in New York, and also between them and the North Americans. He did not feel the prejudice against the great Northern Republic which is so frequent among Spaniards and South Americans, and he was on affectionate and familiar terms with many Americans of the States. There was every reason to hope that he had much to give towards furthering understanding between these peoples.

His Disappearance.

Professor Galindez was a tireless advocate of freedom. Apart from the cause of his own native Basque country and of the Spanish Republic, he had particularly at heart the liberation of the peoples of the Dominican Republic from the tyranny which he himself had experienced. During the years of his residence in New York he became Enemy Number One of the Dominican dictator, Trujillo. His doctoral thesis, which was accepted and approved by Columbia University, is a documentary study of some 700 pages, giving a systematic appraisal of the origins, development and present characteristics of the dictatorship.

Galindez was threatened several times and in various ways by agents of Trujillo. Whenever this occurred, he informed the police. Considerable evidence of his anxiety on this score has been found among his documents. He had foreseen the possibility of his disappearance and had indicated that Dominican agents would be responsible. Together with this prediction, in 1953, he made his will. In connection with his doctoral thesis he took extensive precautions. Apart from the original, to be presented to Columbia University, he placed two copies in English in New York, and another copy in Spanish in Santiago de Chile.

Lurrean lore ziñan, lore garbi lirain;
zeruan izar zera, izar argi orain.

Zu iltzean erriak, lore bat galdu zun,
ta izar eder bat piztu, zeruan zitzaigun.

Pozgarri auxe dugu, alare munduan,
gure oroitz izar bat, dagola zeruan.

Aita Salbatore Mitxelena

Frantziskotarra

GOYAN BEGO

18 - I - 1919
20-XII-1965

ICHAROPENA - ZARAUZ

In February 1956, he wrote an article in *Euzko-Deya*, a Basque Review published in Mexico, entitled " Two Governments Dissent." The article described the meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 14th, 1955, in which Franco Spain was admitted to membership of UNO. All the countries represented at the meeting, including democracies of many shades of political complexion, as well as dictatorships, voted for Franco's admission, with the exception of Belgium and Mexico. " I have been called crazy " he added, " because I continue to uphold the principles for which I fought years ago among the Pyrenees. For as long as there is no freedom, I will continue to shout for it. God grant me the strength to go on being ' crazy ' until the day I die."

These words, with which he ended his last article, have a prophetic ring ; a foreboding of his death, which he met because of this " crazy " persistence in the cause of freedom.

The following is a quotation from his will : " I declare myself to be a Christian and a Basque. As such, I wish to be buried in the Faith and in the land of my ancestors, as soon as may be. I beg whoever takes charge of my body and my possessions to ensure that my remains are taken one day to Amurrio, Province of Alava, Euzkadi (Basque country) to be buried there. I would like to be on my father's estate, in Larrabeobe, on the high ground, from where one can see the mountains of my homeland. The necessary sum shall be set aside from my possessions for this purpose."

After the various provisions of his will, among them the donation of his library to the Library in Amurrio, he ends with the words " Gora Euzkadi Azkatuta ! (Long Live the Free Basque Country !) I commend my soul to God."

The Kidnappers.

Public opinion, and the testimony of his friends point, as he did, to the Dominican Republic as responsible for the disappearance of Galindez.

The Hispanic Committee of New York laid this accusation before the Director of the Federal Office of Investigation on behalf of 248 civic, social and fraternal organizations. Among the organizations which supported the petition were the American Committee for Cultural Freedom, (affiliated to the Congress for Cultural Freedom), the American Catholic Trade Union Committee, the International League for the Rights of Man, and the Latin-American Committee of the A.F.L.-C.I.O. (trade Unions).

Galindez is not the first victim of the Dominicans. His predecessors were Virgilio Martinez Reinas in 1930, Sergio Bencosme in 1935, Mauricio Baez in 1950, Andres Requena in 1952, Manuel de Jesus Hernandez in August 1955, and Manuel Acevedo about the same time as Galindez himself. All these men were refugees from the Dominican

Republic. Baez and Hernandez fell in Habana, and their fate was the subject of diplomatic notes to the Dominican Republic, of which the outcome is still pending. The others met their end in New York. Norman Thomas, commenting upon these antecedents and upholding the accusation against the Dominican dictatorship, announced a reward of 10,000 dollars, offered by a number of societies, for any person who might supply facts or proofs sufficient to arrest and condemn those responsible for the kidnapping and murder of Galindez.

The press, university circles and students of the United States and South America have discussed the case extensively. Apart from the professors and students of Columbia University, the most active protagonists have been the New York Times and New York Post and the journals *Life* and *Time*. In South America, the Argentine press and voluntary organizations have been particularly active. The disappearance of the Basque professor was the subject of several questions put to President Eisenhower at his Press Conference. In the New York Times statements have been published from Mr. Grayson Kirt, President of the University of Columbia, and from professors Reginald Parker and Frank Tannenbaum (a member of the examining Committee which approved Galindez' thesis.). Other signatories of letters to this paper include Roger N. Baldwin, Norman Thomas, Francis R. Grant, Serafino Romuladi, and German Ornes, ex-editor of *El Caribe*, the official paper of the Dominican dictator.

In the New York Post, Judge Graymore accused Dominican agents of having kidnapped and murdered the Basque professor. Judge Graymore was a member of the " Requena Memorial Committee " set up in 1952 in honour of Andres Requena, murdered by agents of Trujillo. The " Daily Spectator," students' journal of the University of Columbia, has described the foundation and activities of the university group " Pro-Galindez Students."

In Europe the case of Galindez has not aroused the same profound emotion that has stirred American and Basque opinion. I am his compatriot and friend, and share his religion and political creed. In the name of the Basque Government I signed his nomination as Legal Attache to the Basque Government in Madrid. As Minister of Justice of the Republican Government I authorized his activities as Legal Adviser to the General Administration of Prisons, and as President of the Basque National Council I approved his appointment as Secretary of the Basque Delegation in the Dominican Republic. I consider the cause of Galindez to be one of those issues that concern the freedom of men and peoples. It is my earnest desire, in writing these lines, that a knowledge of the facts may contribute towards awakening a general sense of solidarity in this cause. Today, as much as when St. Louis, King of France, first declared it, all human freedoms are our common heritage.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM IN THE U.S.A.

by

ARTHUR SCHLESINGER, Jr.

Arthur Schlesinger Jr. is Professor of History at Harvard University. In this article he outlines the development and present state of academic freedom in America, on the basis of three important documents published in recent months: " The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States " by Richard Hofstadter and W. P. Metzger ; " Academic Freedom in our Time " by R. M. Mac Iver (both published by Columbia University Press 1955) *; and " Academic Freedom and Tenure in the Quest for National Security," the report of a special committee of the American Association of University Professors, published in A.A. U.P. Bulletin, Spring* 1956.

Under a grant from the Louis M. Rabinowitz Foundation, Columbia University set up in 1951 the American Academic Freedom Project, to inquire into past history and present condition of academic freedom in the United States. The two volumes under review represent the outcome of the Columbia study ; the conclusions they express are those in the true spirit of academic freedom—of the authors, and not of the Rabinowitz Foundation or of Columbia University. It has also seemed pertinent to consider in this connection the recent report on " Academic Freedom and Tenure in the Quest for National Security " rendered by a special, and distinguished, committee of the American Association of University Professors.

The two Columbia volumes differ markedly in approach, scope and flavour. Professors Hofstadter and Metzger have undertaken an analytical account of the emergence of the idea of academic freedom in American education ; Professor MacIver's book, more polemical and *engagé* in tone, seeks to describe and evaluate the current crisis of academic freedom. Together, along with the A.A.U.P. report, they furnish the material for one more consideration of the subject about which, as Sidney Hook has said with only slight exaggeration, " more sloppy rhetoric (has been) poured out per page, both by those who believe they are supporting it, and those intent on criticizing it, than on any other theme with the possible exception of democracy."*

The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States provides the indispensable background for any appraisal of the contemporary state of American academic freedom. In the first half, " The Age of the College," Mr. Hofstadter deals with what he properly calls the " prehistory " of academic freedom. He begins with an account

*Sidney Hook, *Heresy, Yes—Conspiracy, No* (New York, 1953), page 13.

of the European legacy, in particular the idea of corporate autonomy which the great universities of the Middle Ages painfully won for their faculties and students. This sense of corporate autonomy began to decline in Europe, however, well before the first American foundation at Cambridge in 1636. In its place, as a source of libertarian influence in education, there arose the post-medieval notions of humanism, toleration and religious freedom. But in America these notions, like the memory of medieval corporate independence, had only a vague impact compared to the stern and concrete requirements of religious denominationalism. "For about two hundred and fifty years after the founding of Harvard in 1636," Mr. Hofstadter writes, " the very form in which the problem of freedom was posed in American colleges in so far as there was a formulation of the problem of freedom, was set by the conditions of religious sectarianism."*

Control by private denominational sponsorship was only one characteristic of the distinctive American pattern of higher education which developed in the 17th and 18th centuries. In addition, the American colleges were, at best, only colleges, and mostly no more than academies or high schools ; they all lacked the professional and advanced faculties of the European universities. And the American colleges were developing a unique system of academic government, under which legal control rested, not in the European manner with the faculties themselves, but with outside boards made up of non-resident, non-teaching " trustees " or overseers. In this environment, the teacher counted for little. There was as yet little attempt to define academic freedom as a standard or even as an ideal. The notion of free inquiry affected the colleges more or less as a secondary effect of the larger social drift into ways of secularisation, political liberty and science.

Yet, as Mr. Metzger points out in " The Age of the University," the generation after the Civil War witnessed a transformation in the American educational scene, the recession of denominational control ; the rise of the modern university, complete with graduate schools ; the professionalisation of the American faculty ; and the domestication in the United States of German ideas of *Lehrfreiheit*. The struggles of individual professors for the right of free expression, especially in connection with the Darwinian debate, resulted in the crystallisation of the modern American conception of academic freedom, a conception which went beyond the German in asserting the professors' right to freedom for extramural utterance and for political participation as well as to freedom in teaching and scholarship. These struggles for free expression also produced the American Association of University Professors, which still represents the most serious organised effort by American professors to formulate and defend the liberties they regard as essential to the performance of their duties.

*Hofstadter and Metzger, page 63.

Professors Hofstadter and Metzger have tackled a bold assignment with intelligence and spirit. In a sense, perhaps they, committed themselves to an impossible task. " Academic freedom " cannot be easily isolated as an idea in the period before anyone was thinking in such terms ; and the search for anticipations of the idea can lead into all aspects of the social and intellectual world in which the educational system existed. The result in the Hofstadter-Metzger volume sometimes tends to be an unstable compromise between the history of higher education and the history of ideas, in which the excursions into the broader field have a certain random and sketchy quality. Yet this is more than offset by the penetrating insights with which both Mr. Hofstadter and Mr. Metzger scatter their texts. And out of their materials there emerges the strong impression that one key factor in the history of academic freedom has been the status of faculty members, that is, the value placed on them by the rest of the community.

It was the desirability of the medieval scholars which gained them their immunities. As Mr. Hofstadter writes, " The universities were centres of power and prestige, protected and courted, even deferred to, by emperors and popes." And it was the low estate occupied by teachers in 17th century America which placed the first American colleges in so vulnerable a position. Professor Merle Curti, in a new book, has suggested that the American idea in education was to end the European dualism between thought and action, to reject the idea that intellectual enterprise should be the monopoly of a separate class.* This American approach has been in the long run a source both of weakness and of strength for the American intellectual. But, in colonial America, it plainly lowered the status of the teacher. Thus for nearly a century, the Harvard faculty consisted of two or three " tutors," that is, unmarried men in their early twenties waiting for their M.A., degrees and appointment in the Church. Harvard did not even have a professor until 1722. Even in the early 19th century, college teaching remained an inferior occupation with small dignity or authority. " One finds the trustees of colleges," Mr. Hofstadter writes, " prescribing the work of the classroom, writing the laws of student government, shaping the curriculum, subjecting the private lives of teachers to scrutiny and espionage."†. The professor had little initiative in the college and little respect in the community, and had to spend a disproportionate amount of his time disciplining the unruly boys left in his care. On the eve of the Civil War, annual salaries of $1,000 were customary ; and the change from teaching to other professions, the ministry, law, even business, was made easily and often.

The great change that took place after mid-century was the professionalisation of the college faculties. Oddly enough, the need to

*Merle Curti, *American Paradox* (New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1956), pages 4-11.
†Hofstadter and Metzger, page 304.

maintain student discipline seems to have been an early factor in inducing trustees to delegate more authority to faculties. At the same time, the chronic financial insolvency which afflicted so many colleges brought about a shift in sponsorship from religious denominations to business ; and, though business sponsorship in time created problems of its own, it meant also a great increase in the amount of funds available for education. The largest single gift to an American college before the Civil War had been Abbott Lawrence's $50,000 to Harvard, a trivial sum compared with such post-war donations as Rockefeller's $34,000,000 to Chicago. Members of a faculty, endowed with new power, new money and new opportunity for scholarship, were quick to respond to new intellectual currents and especially to the dazzling example of the German university. Under this stimulus, America began at last to develop a body of professional teachers with status of their own in the community, capable of defining their professional rights and uniting to secure them. The idea of academic freedom thus came as the ideological counterpart of the professionalisation of education.

Professor Metzger watches academic freedom receive a formal definition at the hands of the A.A.U.P. in 1915 and sees it through the vicissitudes of the First World War. Professor MacIver then takes up the current story. *Academic Freedom in the United States* describes the impact on the academic profession of what Professor MacIver calls " the new wave of intolerance," stirred by " the champions of the new orthodoxy." He analyses the lines of attack on academic freedom and suggests what can be done about it. While he warns against the tendency of foreign observers to take cases out of context in order to " exhibit a lurid picture of the state of democracy in this country," he himself inclines to a dark view. " It is hardly an exaggeration," he writes, " to say that the weight of authority in the United States is now adverse to the principle of intellectual freedom."*

Other eminent opinion has endorsed this dismal conclusion. Thus Robert M. Hutchins : " Everywhere in the United States university professors, whether or not they have tenure, are silenced by the general atmosphere of repression that now prevails." And Justice William O. Douglas : " An ominous silence has settled on many campuses of the country. Professors and students alike are afraid."† Even " Academic Freedom and Tenure in the Quest for National Security," the measured report issued by a special committee of the American Association of University Professors, declares, " Academic freedom and tenure in the United States have been more greatly imperilled since World War II than for many years before " (though it adds, " It remains true that effective teaching, objective research, and intellectual interest in contemporary issues continue on most American campuses ").‡

*MacIver, Pages 32, 266.
†Quoted by Sidney Hook, " The Strategy of Truth," and Milton R. Konvitz, " Are Teachers Afraid ?," *New Leader*, February 13, 1956.
‡" Academic Freedom and National Security," pages 50, 53.

Nor can there be any question that there has been a shameful series of attacks on freedom in American colleges and universities in the last half dozen years; the A.A.U.P. report contains a valuable summary of eighteen of the most notorious cases. Yet it hardly seems that even these indefensible occurrences quite justify Professor MacIver's gloomy verdict that the weight of authority in the United States has swung against academic freedom. The A.A.U.P. committee does not think so. "Sober confidence in academic personnel, rather than zeal to ferret out subversion, seems to prevail," it concludes, "as the nearly universal mood today." And Professor Metzger, in Professor MacIver's companion volume, offers similar testimony: "A more sympathetic and profound understanding of academic freedom is more widespread among teachers, administrators, and trustees today than in 1917," and, he might have added, than in any earlier year in American history.* It can be convincingly argued, indeed, that the very intensity of the contemporary outcry over violations of academic freedom is a measure of the unprecedented extent to which the principles of academic freedom themselves are cherished.

Yet, if this is so, why should Professor MacIver and Dr. Hutchins and Justice Douglas, all men of unquestioned good faith, write as they do? Why should even the A.A.U.P. committee suppose that academic freedom is more greatly imperilled today than for many years? It is conceivable that the explanation for this widespread anxiety has to do, once again, with the status of the teaching profession. What Professor MacIver and the others may well reflect is less an objective decline in the acceptance of the idea of academic freedom than a subjective apprehension over the rising tempo of threats to the place of professors in the community. The higher the status, indeed, the more sensitive a group often becomes to real or fancied threats. A campaign against a fairly well-established profession might well induce a greater amount of subjective anxiety than a similar campaign against a disorganised and dispirited group, and this fact accounts, I think, for both the greater amount of academic freedom and the greater concern over it in American universities today than half a century ago.

Other factors have increased the sense of vulnerability among professors. One factor surely has been the change from Democratic government, where intellectuals had a sense of participation, to Republican government, which recoils from ideas and sneers at those who have them as "eggheads." Another has perhaps been a sense of guilt among some members of the academic community over past acceptance of illusions about the Soviet Union and Communism. And, as the business community has returned to power in the nation, its chronic anti-intellectualism, aggravated by memories of the arrogance of the intellectuals of the thirties, has put the colleges and universities

*"Academic Freedom and National Security," page 98; Hofstadter and Metzger, page 506.

on the defensive. But what is really at issue has been not so much "academic freedom" itself as the self-respect and reputation of the academic profession. The specific infringements of academic freedom have been relatively limited, but the slander of the profession has been insistent and pervasive.

The guess that professional status rather than academic freedom may be the first stake in the current fight is borne out by passages in the A.A.U.P. report. The A.A.U.P. committee was much preoccupied, for example, with the "stigma" laid on the academic profession by the spreading assumption that teachers were in special need of supervision and discipline. It is this concern, of course, which explains why the teacher's oath rouses an abhorrence in the academic profession out of apparent proportion to its immediate effects. The A.A.U.P. report discusses these questions with dignity and eloquence. "Nothing in the record of college and university teachers as a group," it writes, "justifies the imputation to them of a tendency toward disloyalty. We particularly object to these measures (of investigation and supervision) when they are directed against members of the academic profession as a special class apart from the population as a whole. Not only the harsh examples of unwarranted dismissals, but also the accumulation of humiliating oaths and statutory inquiries into loyalty and beliefs, render the academic profession less worthy than it once was of the adherence of intelligent, fine-spirited young men and women."*

Yet the impulse among teachers to identify the question of status with the question of freedom is, in the long run, correct; for, if the campaign against their status succeeds, then the battle against their liberty becomes only a mopping-up operation. And, in defending their professional status, the professors are doing much more than meanly defending their own livelihood. "We firmly believe," as Samuel Eliot Morison has well put it, "that academic freedom is in the public interest. We do not claim it as a special privilege for our own protection; we uphold it for the protection of society, against the results of quenching the flame of original thought, the terrorisation of opinion, the subservience to authority, which have been proved to be the bane or the destruction of every government that has adopted such procedures as their policy." † This conviction that the vindication of academic status is a vindication of free society itself, has increased the sense of urgency with which professors view the attacks on their loyalty.

I believe that a misconception of the character of McCarthyism has further strengthened the slight persecution complex which has drifted over American faculties. If McCarthyism (by which I mean not the routine tendencies toward repression but the hysterical intensification of these tendencies in the 1950-54 period) be considered a permanent

*"Academic Freedom and National Security," pages 53, 56-57.
†"Harvard University and Academic Freedom," *A.A.U.P., Bulletin*, Spring, 1954 (pages xl, 11).

feature of American life in the cold war, then the crisis of academic freedom is indeed grave. But, if McCarthyism is a passing phenomenon, then the situation is not so ominous. The A.A.U.P. report seems to assume the permanence of McCarthyism when it contends that the " indefinite continuation of the ' cold war ' against Soviet Communism makes the current suppresions of unpopular opinions and the violations of civil liberties unlikely to subside within the immediate future." Yet a few sentences later, the report adds, somewhat inconsistently, " There has lately been evidence of growing moderation." I doubt whether this " growing moderation " is a consequence of any slackening in the cold war. It seems far more likely to me to be the consequence of the end of the Korean War ; and I think we would understand McCarthyism far better if we regard it, not as a function of the cold war, but as a function of the hot war in Korea.

What gave McCarthy his brief contact with the emotions of more than a handful of Americans was the peculiar situation of 1950-53. Here the United States was engaged in a bitter war in Korea in circumstances where, for reasons which were excellent but imperfectly grasped, the full force of American power could not be unleashed against the aggressor. And, while Communists killed Americans in Korea, other Communists walked the streets of America with impunity. It was this sense of impotent frustration and anguish that gave McCarthy his opportunity. It was predictable that, when the Korean War came to an end, the emotions which sustained McCarthyism would begin to taper off, and that soon McCarthy too would come to an end as a serious public menace.

The renewed sense of status vulnerability, the slanders against the academic profession, the swing from pro-intellectual to anti-intellectual attitudes in government, the misinterpretation of McCarthyism as a permanent phenomenon of the cold war, all these factors help account for the fact that American professors *feel* so strong a pressure on their academic freedom at a time when it can be argued that the sense of the meaning of academic freedom has never been so widespread. And the very anxieties which, for example, have led Professor MacIver and others into extravagant statements may well make it less likely that the MacIver fears will be realised. Social balance emerges out of a rough jostle of pressures. As Dr. Milton R. Konvitz of the Cornell Law School has written, " It is right and necessary that one should cry out against any attack on academic freedom, even though there is a danger of exaggerating the evil " (to which, of course, Professor Sidney Hook's footnote is assumed, " I do not believe it is necessary to lie even in the interests of justice ").*

But, even if one rejects the more sensational pictures of the black silence of fear settling down over American campuses, there is nothing in the situation of academic freedom in the United States to cause undue

*Konvitz, " Are Teachers Afraid ? " ; Hook, " The Strategy of Truth."

complacency. If the academic profession weathers this crisis, it will be because of its members and friends who fought back, not because of those who took to the storm cellars. In any society, professions, like people, must show themselves tough enough to deserve respect if they are to win it. Yet, while fighting back, it is important, especially for members of the academic community, to retain a sense of discrimination over words and issues and not to confuse, as Emerson once said, the sound of a popgun with the crack of doom.

On the whole, it seems to me, the A.A.U.P. report has done this very well. Its main message is that every case involving academic freedom must be judged individually. The fact that this thought so appals the editorial writer of *Life* *shows how collectivism, when the door is barred, sometimes creeps in even through the most anti-Communist of windows. What the A.A.U.P. committee was seeking to do, I take it, was to reaffirm the truth given classical statement by Charles Evens Hughes, " It is of an essence of the institutions of liberty that it be recognised that guilt is personal."†

Professor Hook is right, I think, in expressing the wish that the report had emphasised the importance of academic integrity as well as of academic freedom.‡ The A.A.U.P. was founded to elevate the profession as well as to defend it. The present report errs in accepting too tolerantly practices (such as pleading the Fifth Amendment) which must be defended as part of academic freedom but do not on that account have to be admired as expressions of academic integrity. Yet I would dissent from Professor Hook's conclusion that the report should be condemned as a " basic evasion " of " the problem of Communism and Communist teachers in colleges and universities." He himself writes a few lines later :" Today, there are no or hardly any Communist party teachers active on American campuses," which makes one wonder what the problem is.§ The A.A.U.P. report, as its title suggests, was addressed to the larger problem of reappraising the meaning of academic freedom in the cold war. Its broad analysis, in my judgment, is thoughtful and judicious. It provides an admirable conclusion for the diverse developments reported by Professors Hofstadter, Metzger and MacIver. One hopes that it will turn out in the end as much a landmark in the evolution both of the academic profession and the idea of academic freedom as the old A.A.U.P. report of 1915. Its spirit, in any case, is one of a moderation and realism which have been all too rare in discussions of academic freedom in recent years. This is surely the spirit to build on in the future.

*" Professors and Ethics," *Life*, May 21st, 1956.
†Quoted by Zechariah Chafee, Jr., *Free Speech in the United States* (Cambridge, 1941) pages 471-2.
‡Sidney Hook, "The A.A.U.P. and Academic Integrity," *New Leader*, May 21st, 1956.
§Even on Communist Party membership, Professor Hook's position : " although this should not be an automatic ground for dismissal, it should constitute a presumption of unfitness," seems indistinguishable from the A.A.U.P. position.

distortion and misapplication when strong personalities are involved, with deeply rooted convictions reacting against or supported by strong currents of public opinion. Under such circumstances a professor's utterances in the classroom, or his outside activities and affiliations, may seem to him but the discharge of his professional obligations and the exercise of his rights as a citizen, while the administration of his institution may look upon them as a violation of his professional integrity. Hence the importance of the second part of the *1940 Statement of Principles* which deals with tenure and the proper procedure for abrogating it.

The principle governing tenure reads as follows: "After the expiration of a probationary period teachers or investigators should have permanent or continuous tenure, and their services should be terminated only for adequate cause, except in the case of retirement for age, or under other extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigencies."

Here a few words of explanation are in order. Tenure (i.e. security) in American colleges and universities is of two sorts. At the beginning of his career a teacher is usually appointed for one year, or for a short term of years. Such appointments are usually made by means of contracts specifying the period for which the university or college commits itself, and they are usually appointments to the lower ranks, such as instructorships or assistant professorships. But appointment to a full professorship, and sometimes appointment to an associate professorship, is regarded as continuous, or indefinite; that is, it is expected that the appointment will continue for the professional lifetime of the person concerned, if he so desires. This is what is generally meant by "tenure" in American academic life when the term is used without qualification. Sometimes this indefinite tenure is recognised as belonging to a person in a lower rank who has served his institution for a number of years—for a period presumably long enough for his disqualifications, if there are any, to become evident. Some institutions officially recognise this method of attaining tenure and those that do not are obviously under a strong moral pressure to grant it in fact. These principles of tenure are fairly generally recognised in our colleges and universities. The 1940 *Statement of Principles* provides for a maximum period of seven years before tenure is conferred. A teacher has security against dismissal, for the duration of his term, if he is on limited tenure, and if on indefinite tenure, for his professional lifetime.

The difficult cases are those in which an institution thinks it is justified in abrogating the tenure of a member of its staff. As long as professors and administrators are human, such cases will arise. The A.A.U.P. recognises that the withdrawal of tenure is sometimes justified because of academic incompetence, moral turpitude, or on other grounds. Here it insists only that the decision to terminate tenure cannot be made

arbitrarily by the administration; it must be arrived at by what is known in Anglo-American tradition as "due process." Some of the elements of this due process are enumerated in another paragraph of the *1940 Statement*, a paragraph which has proved to be in practice the most important part of the document: "Termination for cause of a continuous appointment, or the dismissal for cause of a teacher previous to the expiration of a term appointment, should, if possible, be considered by both a faculty committee and the governing board of the institution. In all cases where the facts are in dispute, the accused teacher should be informed before the hearing in writing of the charges against him, and should have the opportunity to be heard in his own defence by all bodies that pass judgment upon his case. He should be permitted to have with him an adviser of his own choosing who may act as counsel. There should be a full stenographic record of the hearing available to the parties concerned. In the hearing of charges of incompetence the testimony should include that of teachers and other scholars, either from his own or from other institutions."

These elements of due process are academic analogues to procedures generally accepted as necessary in court trials to prevent a biassed finding and a miscarriage of justice. Their use in academic life has become increasingly common, and responsible administrations now recognise that the termination of tenure must be accompanied by due process, if they are not to incur the censure of the A.A.U.P.

The only sanction that the A.A.U.P. can employ to secure observance of its principles is censure, or the threat of it. Fairly early in the history of the Association, Committee A was given the responsibility of conducting investigations of cases in which violations of academic freedom and tenure were alleged to have occurred, and to issue reports recommending censure of the administrations concerned if that seemed to be warranted. Such recommendations of censure are not adopted lightly. They are first referred to the Council of the Association, and if this body concurs, are laid before the annual meeting for ratification or rejection by the delegates of local chapters and other members in attendance. Because of the careful inquiries that precede these reports of Committee A, and the judicious quality of the reports themselves, the Association has in the course of years acquired an authority far beyond its actual power. Its legal power is in fact nothing at all; its authority is purely moral, and rests upon the intrinsic justice of the principles it applies, and the reputation for fairness and impartiality that its successive committees have won.

But this authority, purely moral as it is, is not such as to be lightly regarded by any university or college administration. A list of censured administrations is carried in every issue of the quarterly *Bulletin* of the Association. This serves not only as a public reproof by the professional association most intimately involved, but also as a warning to prospective applicants for positions that conditions of freedom and tenure are

not satisfactory at those institutions. This has operated quite generally as a deterrent to the better qualified persons in the profession from considering offers of positions at the censured colleges and universities, and consequently as a handicap to these institutions in recruiting persons of high quality for their staffs. The threat of censure, the unfavourable publicity attending it, and the real disadvantages consequent upon it, have led college and university administrations to pay increasing regard to the principles of due process, and to consult with the officers of the Association on controversial cases where the application of these principles is difficult or unclear. And most institutions that are placed on the list of censured administrations make serious efforts to have the censure removed as early as possible, through changes in their administrative procedures and personnel, and sometimes by re-opening the cases which had led to censure.

New and difficult problems have been presented to the A.A.U.P. by the special measures taken in the United States during the past six or eight years to combat subversion and espionage, and by the strong public opinion which, however it may criticize details of the security programme and its administration, undoubtedly supports the purpose that underlies it. These measures have inevitably affected academic institutions as well as other agencies in our society. They have included provisions to safeguard research and information important for military security; and against these the A.A.U.P. opposes no objection, where they are clearly relevant to the purpose alleged. They have also included requirements of disclaimer oaths, sometimes imposed by state legislatures and sometimes by boards of trustees, for teachers in colleges and universities.

The boards of trustees of some colleges and universities, sometimes supported by declarations of their faculties, have announced a policy of not appointing to their staffs any member of the Communist Party, and of refusing to continue his appointment if such a person has inadvertently been appointed. Congressional investigators have found some members of college and university faculties reluctant to answer questions, and even invoking the Fifth Amendment to evade the responsibility of giving evidence. This article of our Bill of Rights (as the first ten amendments to the Constitution are usually called) provides that " no person shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself." Hence to invoke the Fifth Amendment to avoid giving answers to a Congressional committee of investigation has often been interpreted as equivalent to an admission that there are past criminal acts which the witness does not wish to reveal. A few state legislatures have passed laws making the invocation of the Fifth Amendment *ipso facto* ground for dismissal of any state employee—a law that affects the faculties of state colleges and universities, since they are legally the employees of the state; and a few, though not many, independently supported institutions have announced through their

administrations that invocation of the Fifth Amendment warrants dismissal from the faculty.

These measures present threats to academic freedom which were not envisaged by the framers of the *1940 Statement of Principles*. It is clear that that statement needs to be supplemented, at least, to take account of these new developments; and it might even seem that the principles it affirms need to be revised in the light of recent experience with Communism and the threat to the educational process itself through Communist methods of infiltration and indoctrination. There has been a lively debate among academic men on this issue. Some (including at least one charter member of the Association and an eminent champion of academic freedom) have argued that membership in the Communist Party *ipso facto* disqualifies a man for an academic post, since it deprives him of that freedom to think for himself and to express his opinions without dictation which is the fundamental condition of academic integrity. But others, and these are the vast majority of the Association, however fully they may agree with the presumption that a Communist lacks the fundamental prerequisite of academic integrity in a free society, have held fast to the principle of due process and asserted that every case has to be decided on evidence relevant to it, not by inference from a general assumption that may or may not hold in all cases and may possibly not apply to the case under examination.

The official view of the Association, as expressed in declarations of Committee A and in resolutions passed at every annual meeting since 1950, is that: " Neither the organisational affiliation of a teacher, if lawful, nor his social, economic, political and religious beliefs . . . are sufficient evidence of disqualification for work in the academic profession." And in a report adopted at the last annual meeting it was affirmed: " This governs the question of dismissal for avowed past or present membership in the Communist Party taken by itself."

To guard against misunderstanding I should add that the Association does not hold that the question of Communist membership or affiliation should be regarded as irrelevant. In the report adopted at the last annual meeting, to which I have just referred, it is distinctly said that an institution cannot ignore evidence of this sort; when such evidence comes to light a preliminary inquiry by the administration is justified and can become a duty, and it may lead to the formulation of charges and a hearing upon the man's fitness for his position, a hearing which, we maintain, must have the elements of due process enumerated above.

Regarding the invocation of the Fifth Amendment the Association's stand, as expressed at a resolution passed by the annual meeting in 1955, a short time after this kind of case had begun to attract attention, is that: " This is not, in and of itself, justifiable cause for the dismissal of a faculty member."

The Association's position on this point has received powerful support by a recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States

declaring unconstitutional a section of the Charter of the City of New York providing for the automatic dismissal of a city employee on this ground. The Court declared that invoking the Fifth Amendment does not justify an inference of past criminal activity. This decision is peculiarly apt, for it concerns the dismissal in 1953 of a teacher in one of the city-supported colleges. But in cases of this sort, as in cases of alleged Communist Party membership, the Association does not hold that invoking the Fifth Amendment ought to be regarded as irrelevant. Like allegations of Communist Party membership, it justifies the conducting of a preliminary inquiry which may lead to the formulating of charges and a hearing. The Association maintains, however, that the burden of proof (an important issue in any judicial process) rests upon the administrator who brings charges.

In order to clarify in this new context the generally accepted principles of academic freedom and tenure, and to render effective its position in relation to these current issues, the Association at its annual meeting in the spring of 1955 voted to establish a Special Committee to review the cases involving dismissals of faculty members that have occurred since 1948, as a consequence of the quest for national security against Communism. This committee presented its report at the annual meeting in April of this year. After being unanimously approved by the Council of the Association, the general principles in the report were adopted by an overwhelming majority of the delegates and members assembled.

The first part of this report contains a statement of the relevant general principles that guided the judgment of the committee, principles that endeavour to safeguard the academic freedom and tenure that have been the Association's primary concern, and at the same time to do justice to legitimate interests of national security. Besides making clear the Association's stand on the two issues just discussed, this statement declares the Association's opposition to disclaimer oaths as a condition of appointment to a college or university faculty, and urges their abolition as both ineffective in accomplishing their avowed purpose and an affront to the teaching profession. On the other hand it recognises that security precautions as to sensitive research positions are proper and that, more generally, the academic profession has a duty to defend society and itself from subversion of the educational process by dishonest tactics: " Instances of the use of such tactics in the past by secret Communist groups in a few institutions seem to have occurred, and vigilance against the danger of their occurrence in the future is clearly required."

Furthermore, the statement asserts that in a preliminary inquiry conducted by an institution into the qualifications of a faculty member suspected of Communist or other associations that might subject him to attack by public opinion, the suspected person is under an obligation to disclose facts concerning himself that are of legitimate concern to the

institution. " A college or university is entitled to know the facts with which it must deal." But even here a refusal to disclose information should not be regarded as decisive: " A refusal to answer questions which arises from a sincere belief that a teacher is entitled to withhold even from his own institution his political and social views should be accorded respect and should be weighed with other factors in the determination of his fitness to teach."

The heart of this section of the report is the paragraph entitled Grounds of Adverse Action: " A faculty member's professional fitness to continue in his position, considered in the light of other relevant factors, is the question to be determined when his status as a teacher is challenged. Any rule which bases dismissal upon the mere fact of exercise of constitutional rights violates the principles of both academic freedom and academic tenure. Removal can be justified only on the ground established by evidence, of unfitness to teach because of incompetence, lack of scholarly objectivity and integrity, serious misuse of the classroom or of academic prestige, gross personal misconduct, or conscious participation in conspiracy against the government."

With regard to due process, this report makes more emphatic than previous statements the importance of faculty participation in proceedings leading to dismissal. Further: It is an important safeguard that whatever procedure is used should be one that the faculty of the institution has endorsed prior to the occurrence of the case. It is desirable to have procedural matters vested in a standing committee chosen in advance to deal with matters of academic freedom and tenure; *ad hoc* committees may be subject to manipulation or to the suspicion of it. Faculty members should be willing to accept the difficult responsibility of serving on such committees and, when cases are presented, should accept the painful need to reach decisions."

In the following section of its report the Special Committee reviewed the facts of public record concerning dismissals which have occurred since 1948 in eighteen colleges and universities, and in which violation of the principles of academic freedom and tenure is alleged. Some of these incidents had been investigated by Committee A, before the Special Committee was appointed, but no report on any of them had previously been published. As a result of its painstaking study of these cases, the Special Committee recommended censure of six administrations, and further investigation of two others.

This report attracted much attention in the public press when it was issued in March of this year; and the later action of the Council and the annual meeting in adopting its recommendations and statement of principles has brought upon the Association, as was to be expected, some adverse criticism, even from members of the profession and of the Association. Most of this criticism seems to have been based upon a failure to understand precisely the nature of the Association's stand with

regard to Communist membership and the invoking of the Fifth Amendment. As it is coming to be more generally understood that the Association's position is based, not on any tenderness toward Communism, but upon principles of equity in procedure that are well-established elements in the American tradition, the adverse comment has markedly declined. It is too early to make a safe prediction regarding the effect of this report. But it seems not too much to expect that it will eventually be accepted, like the Association's earlier statements of principles, as representing a standard of thought and practice that faculties and administrations alike will increasingly recognise as having the authority both of equity and of professional tradition.

Thus the American Association of University Professors continues to be an important factor in moulding that enlightened public opinion which, as I said at the beginning, is the ultimate support of academic freedom in a democratic society. Men of good will are frequently in doubt what their principles require in specific cases, and what rules of practice are most appropriate to maintain them. Through its careful examination of cases, and its cautious formulation of principles and procedures in the light of its varied experience, the Association has been engaged in building up a body of what one may call " common law " covering academic freedom and tenure. As this common law is progressively accepted, practices and procedures in conformity with it become habits in academic life ; and it is habits and traditions that in the long run present the best defence against the aberrations of public opinion and popular prejudice.

SELF-GOVERNMENT IN AUSTRALIAN UNIVERSITIES

by

GEOFFREY SAWER

Professor Geoffrey Sawer, Dean of the Research School of Social Sciences at Canberra University, Australia, takes as his starting point the Article " University Crisis in Tasmania " which appeared in the December issue of this bulletin. Outlining the broader issues that lay behind this crisis, he examines the general problems of self-government in Australian universities and puts forward a proposal for constitutional reform.

The Case of Tasmania.

The article by the editor of this bulletin in " Science and Freedom " of December 1955 on the university crisis in Tasmania, has attracted widespread notice and interest in Australian universities. The unfortunate events which he describes are still in progress. This writer is spared the embarrassment of taking sides in a dispute concerning many of his friends, since most of the issues involved are now *sub judice* as a result of a court action which has been brought against the University of Tasmania, and a number of individuals connected with it, by a dismissed professor, and any further account of the dispute might therefore constitute a contempt of court.

There is much difference of opinion among Australian university people familiar with the whole story, and with the character of the men concerned, as to the exact degree of responsibility for what happened and as to the best course to pursue in the future. I will only say of the article in the bulletin that, allowing for the fact that the author was wholly dependent on documentary sources, he gives an exceedingly fair and careful account of the main issues involved. One would wish only to alter his emphasis in a few places in a manner which might reduce a little the responsibility of Chancellor Sir John Morris, increase a little the responsibility of Vice-Chancellor Hytten, and make the University's building situation appear a little less deplorable. The sort of extra detail which a fuller report would mention is that the " special matriculation concession " which the Chancellor recommended for a particular student (page 36) came within a well-established category of " special

matriculations ; " it was not a case of the Chancellor asking for something unique to the student in question.

Control by non-Academic Bodies.

But when all the allowances are made, the situation remains that the Tasmanian events illustrated in an extreme form what exists to some degree in every Australian university (and of course in the universities of many other countries), namely the possibility of detailed control over the university's academic policy by bodies in which the predominant influence is not academic. From such bodies, there may come from time to time, demands and pressures on the teaching staff, having their origin in some general or social political policy, which the teaching staff, actuated by some conflicting policy or purpose, will wish to resist.

First, to illustrate the possibilities. (I omit Tasmania, which is in course of being changed). There is much variation in the detail of Australian university government. In all, however, the supreme government of the institution, including power to control every detail of academic life, is vested in a body variously known as Council or Senate. In this article all are included under " Council." Each of these bodies contains substantial academic representation, and representation of graduates of the university. For example, the Senate of the University of Sydney has five representatives of the teaching staff, one representative of the undergraduates and ten elected by graduates of the university: a total of sixteen " university " representatives as against six appointed by the executive government and the houses of parliament. This preponderance of " university " representatives is also found in the Universities of Melbourne, Adelaide, New England and the Australian National University. But in the universities of Queensland and Western Australia, and the New South Wales University of Technology, nominees of the houses of parliament and of the executive government, the latter including usually representatives of departmental interests such as Departments of Education, and of outside public interests such as trade unions, professions and private business, are in a majority.

But the preponderence of " non-university " representation is not the only possible source of friction within the university system of government. Trouble may also arise from the presence in Council of a large membership elected by graduates of the university, either as such or in the body known as " Convocation."

Probably in all universities, and certainly in " Redbrick " ones, it can never be assumed that merely being a graduate identifies a person with the outlook and interests of the university teaching staff, or endears him to the latter's values. There may be, and sometimes is, a definite conflict of view between the body of graduates and the teaching staff for the time being. This is especially likely if the age distribution of the graduates gives a preponderant voice either to an older or to a younger

generation than that represented by the average age of the teaching body.

This factor has influenced very considerably the relations between Australian university law schools and members of the legal profession, even when most of the latter have been graduates. The profession has usually (not always) wished to retain a highly professional, practical system of training with maximum opportunity for office experience. On the other hand, the teaching staffs have usually (not always) wished to increase the non-technical content of the course, abolish non-university entry to the profession, reduce the period of university courses spent in law offices, and lengthen the duration of the full-time course.

The writer picks an example with which he is familiar ; similiar conflicts between " the graduates " and " the teachers " have occurred in many other professional contexts. A further aspect of this potential conflict between graduates and teachers has sometimes been an undignified tendency to organize electoral parties or pressure groups in an effort to ensure that graduates or Convocations elect representatives supporting one view or another. In some cases there are also " revising chambers," acting on behalf of the graduates, variously (and confusingly) called Convocation, Council or Senate. These bodies may sometimes exercise effective power, through standing Committees, over what we have agreed to call the Councils. In other cases they possess a veto or initiating power, or they may have a purely advisory function. In all cases, these " revising chambers " consist of, or are elected by, the graduates of the university, and the pressures of the graduate population may accordingly be exercised at this level. In some States, " packing Convocation " is a well-recognised though sporadic phenomenon.

Parliament and the University.

Pressure from parliaments and governments (Australia has a federal constitution, with six states and a federal government in Canberra) may come from their representation in the University Council, and also from the requirement, common to all these universities, that the statutes made by their governing bodies must be confirmed by the executive government, state or federal as the case may be. Although a considerable range of subordinate regulation-making power is delegated to the various university authorities by these statutes, this authority does not extend to the more general questions of university policy, nor even to such administrative details as the fees to be charged for particular courses.

These possibilities of intervention by the executive government are rarely used, but their use is not unknown. The most characteristic examples have related to questions of matriculation standards or the length of courses, where governments answerable to an egalitarian electorate are anxious to prevent what they regard as undue restriction

of entry to the courses in question. Even the inclusion of a particular type of subject in the curriculum has been questioned. Probably anticipation of government objection has inhibited pursuit of particular policies by university Councils even more than actual intervention by the executive. This, however, is a negative influence only ; it is through direct representation on Councils that governments may initiate policies which the teachers resent.

Direct intervention by parliaments is also possible in certain cases. The statutes of the University of Sydney and of Queensland must be laid on the table of the houses of parliament and can be disallowed by resolution. So far as this writer is aware, however, this veto power has never been used. In other cases, statutes must be tabled for parliament's information, but in the absence of a power to disallow, this creates no more likelihood of legislative intervention in university policy than must exist in any event merely by reason of the heavy dependence of all these universities on the parliaments for a large part of their revenue. In fact, parliamentary discussion of university affairs is unusual. But it should be noted that the parliaments sometimes include in University Acts direct prescriptions on matters of policy. For example, universities are often required to provide certain types of courses for the training of teachers to be employed in the State Education Departments, and to admit such trainees without fee. The University of Melbourne is required to provide some evening courses.

Self Government in Practice.

The above remarks have emphasized the extent to which the opinion of university teachers on basic questions could, in theory, be over-ridden. This must be corrected at once by reference to the actual record of Australian university administration in relation to intervention either by governments or by outside pressure groups, which has, on the whole, been very good.

Most Australian universities have been established on the initiative of men, usually graduates of English universities, who had a thorough appreciation of the meaning of university autonomy and standards. State Governments frequently included few or no university men, but they did, for the most part, appreciate what the sponsors of universities were trying to achieve and accepted gladly the advice of people trained in the English university tradition. The actual process of establishing standards could be put crudely in these terms : import a man from Oxford or Cambridge and accept the entrance and graduation marks which he specifies. In the course of time, Australian society has in various ways, including action through parliament and the executive government, made particular demands on universities and opposed the views of academic staffs. But it is still very substantially the case that Australian university standards are fixed by the teachers, that those

standards challenge comparison with the best university standards in the United Kingdom and in the U.S.A., and that the day-to-day life of the universities goes on in substantial independence of whatever may be the current views on education of parliaments, governments and the general public.

The account of the governing machinery within the universities, which has stressed the possible influence of outside interests, similarly needs to be qualified in the light of actual practice. Each university has a Professorial Board or equivalent body, consisting of the senior teachers of the university. In some cases this body is created and given definite authority by Act of Parliament, in other cases by university statute. There is also a complex system of faculty bodies, all established by university statute, in which there is often a rather higher degree of academic democracy than prevails in universities in other parts of the world. It is in these bodies that the academic standards of the universities are, in general, established and maintained. Very little of the business dealt with by the Councils is initiated within them ; nearly all of it reaches the Councils from the purely academic bodies. Indeed it is, generally speaking, true that the Councils constitute " second Houses," and the Professorial Boards the " House of Commons " in these systems. As Mr. Polanyi's article indicated, a good deal of the trouble in Tasmania arose from the fact that the university is so small that the Council and in particular the Chancellor, have tended to play a predominant part. Similar situations have been experienced by most of these universities in early stages of their growth, but most of them outgrew the stage of Council tutelage many years ago. The exact date at which the professoriate celebrates its institutional coming of age depends largely on " accidents of personality."

The Problem of Standards.

Probably not even the most extreme proponent of academic autonomy in the Oxford-Cambridge style would suggest that the views of non-academics as to the function and working of universities should be disregarded, or that academic bodies should refuse to negotiate with predominantly non-academic bodies in order to seek a friendly adjustment where there is difference of opinion. Should we assume that after discussion and negotiation, the teachers must in the last resort have the power to determine all questions of basic university policy ? The sort of questions I have in mind are : the types of subjects which the university will teach ; the standards it will require for students for admission to the university, generally and for particular types of courses; the standards of achievement it will require for graduation ; the relative place in the course of formal teaching, laboratory work, and apprentice service ; the consequences of repeated failure ; whether courses shall be full-time or part-time ; the times (day or evening, etc.) at which they

will be given ; whether correspondence tuition will be provided ; the duration of the courses. There are, of course, many other problems which may assume general importance, but these particular issues have, at various times, most agitated the Australian universities.

In general, disputes have been a consequence of pressure (usually originating with non-academic bodies) to handle these matters in such a way as to facilitate maximum entry to universities, maximum graduation figures, maximum availability of university teaching and maximum " practicality " of instruction. Academic bodies have on the whole tended to resist these pressures, and in a few cases, have taken the initiative in an attempt to alter existing regulations in a sense opposite to that just mentioned. This is frequently interpreted as an endeavour by the university teachers to maintain standards or to make them higher, as against outside pressure to make those standards lower. That is often a fair enough method of expressing the matter, but not invariably so, because it does not necessarily follow that wider and easier availability of university training leads to a reduction in standards. As Vice-President John W. Gardiner of the Carnegie Corporation of New York points out in the Corporation's Annual Report for 1954, the lowering of admission standards may have the effect of admitting a proportion of people whose ultimate performance is very high, but who would not otherwise have gained entry. This writer would add that the conception of the " total standard " of a university is imprecise. An institution does not necessarily merit criticism because it includes people who would not be admitted to Oxford or Cambridge at one end of its scale, unless at the other end the people whom it lets loose on the community are all at a correspondingly low level.

In Australia, the pressure to lower entrance standards has not been nearly as acute as in the U.S.A., partly because the proportion of the eighteen year old population entering universities (about 6.4 per cent in 1954) is not so high as in the U.S.A. (30 per cent for the same year) though a little higher than in the United Kingdom (5 per cent).* But the pressure is there, and this was one of the factors giving rise to the Tasmanian situation. There are some aspects of this problem which academics in general need to keep in mind, and particularly Australian academics. We must be careful not to take up impossibly dogmatic positions, and we must try to understand in a sympathetic fashion the views of the " outsiders " with whom we have to deal. What to the academic seems merely the defence of an intellectual standard, may seem to the outsider a combination of social snobbery and arrogance. The socialist leader, especially if he lives too much on memories of the past, is apt to equate " maintenance of standards " with maintenance of group privilege. The history of university relations with outside society in Australia in this respect has been a mixed one. Some of the university

*c.f. Annual Report of the Carnegie Corporation, New York, 1954.

leaders of the late 19th and early 20th century, men of great learning and vigorous character, tended to adhere to the conservative side in politics, with the result that the trade unions and the rising Labour parties came to regard the universities as obstructions to social progress. There were university teachers who took quite an opposite political line, and the vast majority among them minded their teaching business and took no part in politics, but the preponderant " myth " on the matter was as indicated. The Australian Labour parties have not had the same fortunate history of leadership from a University-educated élite which existed in Britain. That is one reason why the Australian trade unions have given such little encouragement to university extension teaching. There is no reason why these old hostilities and resentments should determine any issue today. Many more Labour members of parliament are now university graduates, and the universities owe a great deal to the educational policy of the Chifley Federal Labour government (1945-9). But the old resentments are still nourished by some of the old guard, academic and political.

Degrees of Education.

This writer believes that the community is entitled to some voice in determining the place of tertiary education in the education system as a whole, even if its universities are substantially self-supporting, and still more when, as in Australia, they are overwhelmingly dependent on government grants. Further, the community must have some liberty to express these views through the most completely representative institution it has, its parliament and responsible government. However expressed, community pressure is certain, as in the U.S.A., to require the creation of institutions which extend at least some part of what is now tertiary training to greater numbers of people. The solution to this may be in some cases the creation of entirely new institutions. New South Wales has actually been experimenting with that solution by creating a University of Technology, concentrating on the technological aspects of modern science but attempting also to maintain general cultural standards, and a rural university (New England) which concentrates on correspondence courses. The Liberal Arts College in the U.S.A., is a well proven institution also designed to meet the new needs. New South Wales academics are not particularly happy about the results of this solution, but it has at least operated to leave the old established University of Sydney to pursue its accustomed standards. One of the difficulties is that the people running the new experimental institutions may find themselves somewhat rudderless, at least in the early stages of the experiment.

In a small and relatively poor State like Tasmania, that sort of solution is quite impracticable. The only alternative is for the existing University, founded very much on English lines, to modify its system

gradually so as to accommodate the consequences of higher school leaving ages, social demands for people with some but not a full tertiary training and so forth. Perhaps other states, observing the experience of New South Wales, will conclude that this is in any event a better solution than the multiplication of university-type institutions.

The academics who wish to " maintain standards " may purchase the right to do so at too high a price, if the result is that they lose control over the institutions designed to meet the new needs. If the new demands are met within the existing institutions, then there is a possibility of the maintenance of standards by a different method, and on this also we may with profit study the American experience, as shown in such great institutions as Harvard. Taking again the writer's own subject, the Harvard progression from A.B., to LL.B., to S.J.D., represents a process of training beginning at a standard somewhat lower than that at which a person would be admitted to most Australian and British universities, but finishing with a standard higher than that achieved in any system of Australian or British legal education*. The student who finishes at the A.B. stage may go out into the community with a somewhat lesser educational equipment than that of the Oxford or Cambridge B.A., but there can be no question about his utility in society, and at all stages the standards at the highest level are a stimulus. Such a diversification of the goals set by the one institution is more likely to satisfy Australian social needs than a few local universities constituted on the lines of Oxford and Cambridge and a considerable number of " Redbrick " universities specialising in a more utilitarian training, and it has the social economy of using existing procedures to ensure that those capable of the best are given it.

The large multi-purpose institution also has another advantage; the teaching staff can share in a variety of tasks, from the tiring (and testing) business of lecturing to large classes with a low average level of competence, to research or honours teaching at a high level. Academics need to look carefully at another proposition often put forward in connection with the standards question, that good teachers should not be wasted on poor students. Undoubtedly only good students can profitably engage in the team work of post-graduate research, and the advanced seminar of undergraduate honours standard, and they provide a great deal of stimulus for the good teacher. But they also to some extent minister to the teacher's vanity rather than his ability. In this writer's belief, any teacher and research worker will profit by an occasional experience of having to get his basic ideas so straight and clear and well expressed as to be intelligible to students of average ability. A drawback of the " separate institution " solution is that it tends to condemn all the teachers in the " mass standard " place to pass work at low levels,

*I make this assertion dogmatically; doubtless many of my legal colleagues would want to qualify it.

which can become very stultifying, while the élite institution becomes a little too remote for its own good. In the last connection, it is interesting to notice the way in which people fortunate enough to work at the Princeton Institute of Advanced Studies have often found it useful to take some part in the work of the adjacent Princeton University.

A University Grants Committee for Australia.

Although constitutional machinery, as Mr. Polanyi remarks, goes most of the time unnoticed and is often not the decisive factor in social situations, it is possible that Australia can solve some of the problems indicated in this article by taking advantage of its federal structure. One of the troublesome features of that structure at the present time is the clash between the call for central financial control and the call for State autonomy. In 1942, the federal government introduced as a war measure a system of federal monopoly of income taxes. The State income taxes then abolished had been the main source of revenue for the six State governments, which according to the theory of the Constitution, and to a considerable degree in fact, control major aspects of social activity, including education. The federal government already had a preponderant voice in the country's banking, public loan and external trade policies, and although the Liberal-Country Party governments which have been in power since 1949 in theory favour State autonomy, they are under many pressures to preserve the strong centrally controlled financial system created by their Labour Party predecessors. Putting it at its lowest, the vast majority of Australians are happy to have to fill in only one income tax return.

The States accordingly have to get along with a very small volume of taxation controlled by themselves and very large grants made by the Commonwealth as reimbursement for the vanished State income taxes. The degree to which this dependence on the Commonwealth has influenced State autonomy is open to dispute, and in this writer's opinion has been grossly exaggerated. But there are certainly a good many objections to the present state of affairs, particularly the irresponsibility bred of spending money without having to raise it. One way to lessen this evil would to be remove financial and administrative burdens from the State to the Federal sphere, if there is no clear social disadvantage in doing so. The federal government is already heavily involved in the university structure through the magnificent system of scholarships which it provides, instituted by the Chifley Labour government in 1945. In this writer's view, it would be highly desirable for the federal government to take over the whole financial and administrative responsibility for Australian tertiary education, and to administer the system by a University Grants Committee similar to that of the United Kingdom.

The two wealthy states of New South Wales and Victoria could institute local University Grants Committees now, but in the other States

the problem is not nearly big enough to justify such a piece of machinery, and even in Victoria it would probably be regarded as uneconomic to set up a University Grants Committee to act as intermediary between the State Treasury and the single university in that State. But dealing with all the universities of Australia, the Federal Government would find the expense of running a Grants Committee very well justified, and the scope of the problem would be such as to challenge the abilities of men of the highest competence and experience. Even the geographical difficulty is no longer important, since air travel is so extremely well developed. The present Commonwealth Grants Commission, which administers special grants to South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania, would provide in its composition and even in some of its techniques a guide to the activities of the suggested universities body.

Such a scheme would insulate the universities from the sort of government, graduate and in general non-academic pressures to which they are at present subjected, without depriving the community of an adequate say in the development of academic policies. It would probably be desirable to alter the present composition of some of the university governing bodies, in some cases so as to increase non-University representation and in other cases so as to increase academic representation. It would also be desirable for the universities as a whole to accept, as part of this "new start," some general policy on the whole question of entrance standards, special courses for teachers and technicians, and associated problems. With the financial structure of the system thus secured, and insulation from strong local pressures achieved, this writer would then be prepared to give a confident answer to the question of decision in the last resort. It is that in the last resort the teaching bodies should decide all the matters of academic policy mentioned above. The teaching opinion would still be liable to be over-ridden by Act of Parliament, but one of the advantages of federal control would be the unlikelihood of a parliament representing a continent being sufficiently interested to use legislation, unless it reflected a profound and general social need.

NOTE.

Since the above article was written we have been informed that the Chancellor of Tasmania University, Sir John Morris, died on July 3rd. A new Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor will be appointed during this year.—(Ed.)

CO-EXISTENCE WITH SOVIET HISTORIANS

by

WALTHER HOFER

Professor Walther Hofer, of the Free University of Berlin, attended the international historians' conference, held in Rome in December 1955. In this article he gives his impressions of the intellectual contact between Western and Soviet scholars which took place during the meeting.

The appearance of delegates from the Soviet Union and the countries of the Soviet block was really the main sensation at the international historians' Congress, which was held in Rome at the end of last year.

The organizers of the Congress decided, at the outset, that the confrontation between Communist and non-Communist historians which would necessarily result from the attendance of Soviet delegates should be handled in the spirit of " co-existence " and not as an intellectual " cold war." Throughout the conduct of the conference one could see that considerable efforts had been made to accommodate the Soviet delegates. A number of reports and communications from the Soviet countries were inserted into the programme in the final stages. The Russian language was admitted as the sixth official language for the Congress and a Russian representative was invited to join the organizing committee. Madam Pankratova, who is in charge of history teaching in the Soviet Union, and who appeared in this capacity at the recent 20th Party Congress, was elected a member of the executive of the international society of historians.

The delegations from the Soviet countries proved extremely active. The individual discussions in the various sections of the conference, for which only a limited time was available, were very largely occupied with their contributions. It was apparent that the whole body of historians from the Communist countries was subject to a common direction, which naturally emanated from the Russian delegation. The delegates from the various satellite countries had a special role in the discussions. While the Soviet Russian historians were at pains to confine themselves to a non-polemical presentation of the Bolshevik view of history, avoiding as far as possible any disagreeable clash with Western views, it was the task of the historians from the satellite countries to present some

extremely aggressive papers, which put forward the propaganda view of Marxist historical materialism as the one and only scientific approach to history, and severely criticized the Western conception of history.

Soviet History.

The main encounter between the Western and Bolshevik conceptions of history book place in the course of a debate on history in the Soviet Union. The starting point of this debate was a lengthy account of the achievements of Soviet history, running to some sixty pages, which had been submitted by A. L. Sidorov, a member of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. The information in this document was of considerable value to the meeting, and particularly to the specialists in Eastern European history, who were present in large numbers. Even allowing for the fact that Sidorov was naturally concerned to present Soviet Russian history in the most favourable light, it was apparent that the achievements of Soviet scholars had indeed been impressive. The expenditure of funds and the provision of institutional facilities had been on a correspondingly lavish scale, and far exceeded similar provisions in the West. Perhaps the most significant achievements of Soviet scholars were those which lay in the purely systematic field, such as the editing of material contained in letters from the Czars, chronicles, and similar sources for earlier periods of Russian history.

Although Sidorov's paper was undoubtedly intended primarily for Western consumption it was by no means lacking in quotations from Lenin and Stalin, whose pronouncements were put forward, even in this international setting, as the foundations and indeed the axioms of Russian historical writing. The tell-tale marks of Bolshevik historical ideology became increasingly evident as he approached the contemporary period of history. It is here that historical truth begins to give way to doctrinaire fantasy.

Falsification of History.

One of the best known and most significant falsifications of history perpetrated by the Soviets is, of course, the denial of the existence of the secret treaty which was appended to the German-Russian non-aggression pact of August 23rd, 1939, and by virtue of which the whole group of countries stretching from Finland to Roumania was parcelled out between the German and Soviet spheres of interest. There can be no doubt that this pact between Stalin and Hitler constituted for the German dictator the starting signal for the unleashing of a war against Poland and the Western countries which he had long been planning. On the basis of this agreement Hitler was able to count on the neutrality of the Soviet Union. The Russians, for their part, were able to claim their share of Polish and Roumanian territory, to annex the three small

Baltic States, Esthonia, Letland and Lithuania, and to conduct a campaign against Finland which resulted in further annexations.

It is, therefore, a fact beyond all question for any historian who is loyal to scientific objectivity that the Soviet Union favoured and furthered Germany's aggressive plans in order that the Russians might themselves be able to exploit the breakdown of the status quo and derive the maximum advantage from a European war. But these historical facts could hardly be reconciled with the theory concerning the peace-loving intentions of the Soviet Union and the myth of the peace-maker Stalin. Consequently Soviet historical writing has been forced to present the events of the period following 1939 as though there had never been such a secret agreement dividing up the booty between the two dictators. In the official Soviet version the advance of the Russian armies into Eastern Poland in September in 1939 is pictured as being a move to prevent the further penetration of the Germans into these areas. The documents show, however, that this advance and the occupation of the Polish territories took place in full agreement with Hitler.

This particular issue presents a decisive test of the validity of Soviet history as an objective study and I therefore raised it at the Rome Congress. I put forward the view that in this instance, as in many others, Soviet history had shown itself to be subservient to the doctrine of " partyism " and had degenerated to the role of an agent of party propaganda. Mr. Sidorov was personally asked to reply.

It seems to me typical of the confusion of ideas which can result from a mistaken conception of co-existence, that this view of Russian history was rejected by a number of non-communist historians, as much as by the Soviets themselves. And this was so in spite of the fact that an historian from the Eastern German zone had been put up a little while earlier to proclaim with the utmost emphasis that the historians of the Soviet world remained faithful as ever to the doctrines of partyism and rejected the Western conception of objectivity. The impression which had been made, nevertheless, by this intervention upon the leader of the Soviet delegation, was evident from his closing speech when he tried to dismiss the matter with the rather facile comment that Soviet historians had no reason to deny the existence of the pact between Hitler and Stalin. However, the decisive question remained unanswered, namely, why the Soviet historians maintained the falsification of history in spite of their knowledge of the true facts. The whole affair was made all the more piquant by the fact that the Soviet delegation had included among the many historical brochures which were distributed to this meeting, a brief account of the origin of the second World War, which contained this very same falsification of history just as blatantly as all previous presentations.

The events at the Historians' Congress in Rome constitute a fresh proof of the fact that between Soviet and Western ideas of history there

is not merely a nuance of difference but an insuperable contradiction. The attempt to conceal this contradiction in the name of a misconceived tolerance seems to me to have been the great mistake of this conference.

Objectivity—Soviet Style.

It would, of course, be a mistake to imagine that the idea of objectivity is absent from Bolshevik theory of history. In fact, the fundamental basis of dialectical thinking lies in the Bolshevik view of objectivity. On the one hand, objectivity is rejected and an objective attitude is denounced as " objectivism." But on the other hand no less an authority than Stalin himself proclaimed in his book on " Dialectical and Historical Materialism " that the study of history can and must become an exact science in the same sense as natural science. This contradiction, of a type that is allegedly typical of dialectical thinking, is equally evident in an article published by the East German writer on historiography, Leo Stern of Halle, entitled " The Present Task of German Historical Research." In this article the traditional Western conception of objectivity, as represented by Ranke, is sharply criticized and rejected. On the one hand the writer asserts that the so-called objectivity of Ranke and his school, by virtue of which they are supposed to have represented history " as it actually was " is simply a myth. On the other hand, Stern asserts that objectivity of the kind displayed by Ranke is bound to lead in the end to objectivism, which amounts to a complete lack of any positive viewpoint whatever. On the one hand, therefore, we have the objection that there is too little objectivity and on the other hand, we are told that there is too much. Such is the dialectical outcome of Stern's arguments.

This result must inevitably emerge because this concept of objectivity, like so many other Western ideas, is given a content in Communist thought which is fundamentally contradictory to its essential meaning. While the Western conception of objectivity is essentially a principle which implies impartiality, the so-called " scientific socialism " demands a subjective outlook which is labelled " proletarian partyism." Whereas in Western scholarship the principle of objectivity is conceived as standing above all possible parties and ideologies, in the Soviet ideology it is the one and only all-powerful party which itself determines what is objective. Objectivity is itself subordinated to the ruling ideology.

The 20th Party Congress.

It will be remembered that the problem of the correct treatment of historical writing played an important part in the recent 20th Party Congress in Moscow. It is a somewhat ironical fact that precisely Madam Pankratova, whose role at the Rome meeting has already been

mentioned, was chosen by the party leaders to lead the attack on the methods of history so far pursued in the Soviet Union. She spoke of glaring errors due to the omission of important facts and of numerous falsifications and distortions in Russian historical writing, particularly in respect of the roles of Lenin and Stalin in the events following the revolution of 1917, and in many episodes of the Stalin era. We are not concerned here with the details. What is important, however, is the fact that Madam Pankratova was compelled at this Party Congress to pass the same judgement on Soviet history which the present writer had already put forward very forcibly at the Rome meeting, and which appeared to cause her considerable offence on that occasion. The fate of having to denounce one's own previous views is one of the occupational hazards of life under a totalitarian regime.

I think it would be wrong to conclude that the condemnation of the Stalinist conception of history at the 20th Party Congress should be taken to mean the beginning of a period of truly scientific historical work in the Soviet Union. What we have now is the substitution of a new set of official views, which replace the old ones and which are no less far removed from the truth. In the transition from the Stalin era to a new phase there is no abandonment of the idea of " partyism " in favour of a true objectivity, but simply a re-interpretation of partyism. History in the Soviet Union in the post-Stalin period will have the same part to play as in the time of Stalin, namely to serve the policies of the ruling regime. One can gain some idea of the kind of falsification of history that may emerge in the Krushchev era from a study of the observations which the new party leaders made in the course of their visit to India and Burma, on the historical role of Britain and other Western countries in that part of Asia.

History, politics and philosophy are in a close and indeed functional relationship. It is inevitable, therefore, that totalitarian ideologies must necessarily manipulate history in such a way that it will reveal only what is permissible from the point of view of the rulers currently in power. Enslavement of mankind and falsification of their history are two sides of one and the same process : the extinction of the individual's sense of his own destiny, which is fulfilled in personal freedom.

In George Orwell's novel " 1984 " there is a Ministry of Truth which is engaged in a constant re-writing of all historical material and also of current news received from the world press, in conformity with the views of the governing authorities. This utopian fantasy, like so many others contained in Orwell's novel, is unfortunately no longer utopian. What is happening today in the countries within the Soviet sphere of influence is a practical realization of this idea. These countries have to submit to the dictates of the Soviet conception of history and they are forced to accept not only the doctrines of historical materialism, but also the falsification or extinction of national tradition and history wherever

these conflict with the Soviet version. In fact, we have an extinction of national history as a means to the extinction of national freedom.

Free access to their own history will only be allowed to individuals and nations in so far as they live under a political system which itself recognizes the idea of human freedom as a fundamental and inviolable principle. Only in those countries where the freedom of the intellect is protected from all doctrinaire pressures and political compulsions, and where the possibility of unrestrained mutual criticism and, therefore, of a multiplicity of individual viewpoints is granted, can genuine objectivity be maintained. Each varying viewpoint developed in historical research constitutes an aspect of the truth. Marxist ideology is mistaken when it thinks that by raising one such aspect to the status of an absolute truth it can compel history to yield the whole of its true meaning. Indeed, by being raised to such absolute status this particular aspect ceases to be even a partial truth, for it can only retain this much validity so long as it is regarded as no more than a part of the truth.

KRUSHCHEV AND THE "THAW"

by

GEORG VON RAUCH

As a sequel to his article in the December issue of this bulletin, Professor von Rauch of Marburg University examines the regime of limited government-sponsored freedom that has emerged in the Soviet countries after the 20th Party Congress.

Since the 20th Party Congress of the Communist Party which took place in Moscow in February 1956, we are faced with the question as to how far the indications of a loosening of state controls in intellectual life which were described in my article in the Committee's bulletin,* can now be distinguished more precisely, and what new perspectives have opened for the development of intellectual freedom.

Choice of Profession.

In November 1955 Krushchev gave the number of qualified personnel in the Soviet Union who were educated at universities or technical colleges, as 5½ million. It would appear that the current requirements for academically trained people are thereby fully covered, even if there is not as yet any marked excess in the overall supply. Within the field of industrial technology, there are already signs of an excess of university graduates and a shortage of medium grade technicians. A propaganda drive has been launched to guide school leavers into this particular channel, and official encouragement is supported by the following measures :—

(i) Exemptions from fees, and numerous scholarships, for students attending technical colleges with a 2 year training period.

(ii) Introduction of a 2-3 year period of compulsory factory or farm work, or military service, before entry into higher education. This has been strongly recommended during the past twelve months by the Ministry of Higher Education. Evidence of completion of such a period of practical work qualifies for preferential treatment in the entrance examination for universities and technical colleges.

*Science and Freedom, No. 4, December, 1955, pages 29-37.

(iii) Introduction of an examination in a foreign language on entry to the university. (The examination in Russian which has hitherto been in force has been abolished for all except philology students).

(iv) A propaganda campaign among parents and children in favour of a practical profession rather than academic study.

This line of policy and propaganda is concerned to emphasize that the university is not the only way to a satisfying and remunerative professional life, that business activity is still being under-valued, and that bourgeois prejudices against manual pursuits are still far too much in evidence. Parents and youth are urged to put aside these prejudices and to influence young people to enter the factories and the farms. *Pravda* and *Izvestia* have been particularly vocal in this campaign and the latter has pointed out that the present situation, where 75 per cent of all school leavers with matriculation express a preference for the profession of engineer, doctor, or teacher, represents an excessively one-sided state of affairs. A call is made for a more realistic propaganda in this field which will appeal to patriotic and moral motives.

A characteristic example of this kind of propaganda appears in the *Literaturnaya Gazeta* of August 19th, 1954, where an open letter is published from a printer by the name of Chirikov who complains that his son refuses to enter the firm, and wants to study in the university. The editor is asked to help in guiding him on to the right path and to enlighten him on the true needs of the situation. This guidance is then given and the paper adds the significant comment that factory work should be recognized as an honourable pursuit and should be handed down from father to son. It appears that there is here an evidence of the desire of the bureaucracy to establish a principle of hereditary continuity in the choice of profession, which would enable them to keep the industrial classes in their place and to conserve intact for their own children the privileges of the new ruling class.

One also finds the opposite situation, where the son wants to go into business but the parents urge him on, inspired by a mistaken ambition, to pursue university studies. And this apparently happens even though the sons or daughters have failed their university entrance examinations after prolonged preparations and now sit at home doing nothing. (*Izvestia*, July 1955).

Choice of Working Place.

Closely connected with this question of the choice of profession is that of the choice of working place. In July 1955, we find *Pravda* putting forward the view that it is by now a traditional practice among students to volunteer for work in the new lands of Soviet Asia. The idea of the " dark corner " of the country is said to have disappeared. However,

from a further analysis of this article and of other sources, it seems that this assertion was based on wishful thinking. In actual fact students in Russia often refuse, after completion of their studies, to take up work in the places to which they are directed. Frequently, also, we find the parents asking for permission to have their children employed in Moscow or Leningrad. As reasons for these requests it is claimed that living conditions in the Asian republics are bad and primitive, while in the case of girls mention is made of the danger to which they are exposed in these primitive surroundings. In 1954, one-third of the total of young teachers directed to the area of Novosibirsk left the district soon after they had arrived. Responsibility for this resistance against official direction in the matter of the place of work is attributed to inadequate propaganda. The universities, and particularly their faculties of social studies, are called upon to instil in the younger generation the necessary sense of duty required to correct this weakness.

In general, it is remarkable how much evidence there is of actual resistance among parents and students against direction by the state in the matter of the choice of profession and place of work. It would appear that, in particular, the right to freedom of movement, which is denied to the collective peasants and workers in forced labour camps and also, to some extent, to factory workers, is regarded by the student population as a valued privilege which it is not prepared to renounce without a struggle. The state is inclined, in the first instance, to refrain from using drastic means of compulsion, and tries rather to attain its end by propaganda influence and by the various inducements to which reference has already been made. In many cases, particularly in the effort to populate the new lands of Soviet Siberia, the pioneering spirit and urge for adventure among young people comes to its aid. It is a matter for conjecture how far there will be a further liberalization in this field, or alternatively to what extent the state may choose, in cases where trained personnel are urgently needed, to tighten up the reins in the guidance of students towards particular employments and particular places of work.

Student Unrest.

In connection with this question of the attitude of the student population towards the state and the party it is significant to note some recent symptons of student unrest in the Soviet countries. Already in 1953 there were accounts circulating in the West concerning students' resistance groups in Vorkuta and other forced labour camps. These students, who had been assembled from universities throughout the Soviet Union, formed groups under the slogan " back to Lenin " which were, however, forcibly dissolved under the Beria regime. Although this particular slogan has now been adopted by the ruling power, one could hardly expect that this in itself will eliminate all

opposition to the regime among the 3¾ million students at Soviet universities and technical colleges.

While it would be wrong to over-rate the significance of unrest among students, it is worth drawing attention to three events in the recent period. In March 1956, following on the publication of official attacks against Stalin, there were disturbances in the University of Tiflis which led to the exclusion of two students and the dismissal of the secretary of the party committee. The faculty of Western languages appears to have been the actual centre of this unrest. At the same time there were disturbances among the students of the agricultural college at Kutais, the pedagogical institute at Gori and the technical college at Suchum. Under cover of a spontaneous protest against the dethronement of Stalin there were signs of the emergence of tendencies hostile to the regime and in favour of Georgian nationalism.

The second of these events occurred in May, 1956, when 1,500 students protested in the chemical lecture theatre of the technical college at Dresden against an announcement by the pro-Rector that permission to travel to Western Germany would no longer be given. A protest resolution on behalf of the students was sent to President Grotewohl. On the next day 2,000 students assembled to hear the decision of the university authorities. The students had won their point. Travel permits for Western Germany were restored, although subject to limiting conditions.

Finally, one may note the outcome of the experiment in Eastern Germany following the 20th Party Congress in Moscow when it was decided to introduce " youth forums " to discuss the latest phase of Communist policy. After a few of these question-and-answer sessions, which proved extremely embarrassing for the government, this enterprise was discontinued. Here was another incident underlining the weakness of the ruling authorities in Eastern Germany, and its lessons cannot fail to exert their effect on the outlook of the student population.

The events in Tiflis and in Eastern Germany can, at the moment, only be regarded as isolated symptoms. But they are, nevertheless, encouraging indications of the fact that the natural urge for freedom among young people cannot be suppressed once the external constraints are loosened. This urge for freedom constitutes a major threat to the stability of the dictatorial Communist regimes and a great source of strength for the free world.

Science, Literature and Art.

It is significant of the recent period that the loosening of government pressures in intellectual life which was described, in respect of the Soviet Union, in the fourth issue of the Committee's bulletin, has now spread to the satellite countries. In the first instance the " thaw " (an expression coined from the title of the novel by Ehrenburg which has since become

current in ordinary speech) was most evident in Czechoslovakia and Hungary, and to some extent also in Roumania and Bulgaria. A little later the ice began to melt in Poland, and recently the unfreezing process has been particularly marked in this latter country.

After the appearance of the novel " Hotel for Romans " by Kazimierz Brandys, a discussion was initiated in which Zygmunt Kaluzynski and Artur Sandauer took the lead in attacking the party line. Witold Arciszewski attacked, in the *Nova Kultura* of October, 1954, the goverment policy of using art as an instrument of politics. The climax of the movement was the " poem for grown ups " by Adam Wazyk which appeared in the *Nova Kultura* of August 1954. This poem attracted very considerable attention because of the courageous way in which it attacked the prevailing regime in Poland.

In the field of philosophy, Professor Josef Chalasinski of Lodz university was the main spokesman of the new outlook. He openly maintained the view that Marxism had made no progress in Poland because the intellectual uniformity prescribed by the state had stifled all competitive endeavours. In the literary arts, we find Jakub Berman writing in January 1956 in the journal *Nove Drogi :* " so much at any rate is clear ; for genuine literary creative activity one needs not only ideological enthusiasm but also a climate of freedom."

In the Soviet Union one of the most notable developments has been the rehabilitation at the 20th Party Congress of the eminent Russian geneticist Vavilov, who died in exile in 1941, and the dismissal, in April of this year, of T. D. Lysenko from his post as president of the Soviet Agricultural Academy. Parallel with these events, we have in the field of the humane sciences the very serious endeavours now being made to correct the falsifications of history published in the Stalin era, which are reported in *Voprosy Istorii* and other journals. It will be of great interest—not only for historians—to see which of the historical falsifications of Stalinism are actually corrected in the course of this revision, and which will be passed over, as heretofore, in silence. It seems doubtful, for example, even at the present stage, whether the historical role of Trotsky and Bukharin will be fully acknowledged. Another sensitive point of Soviet historical presentation is the concealment of the existence of the secret clauses in the German-Russian pact of August 1939, which formed the basis of Stalin's expansionist policy in Eastern Europe. Here, too, it seems unlikely that the new regime will venture to reveal the full facts to Russian readers.

Significant indications of the future trend of policy were given in the speeches of Mikojan and Shepilov, the present Foreign Minister, at the 20th Party Congress. Mikojan stated on April 16th 1956, that it was absolutely essential that the study of " the new facts and events in the Soviet Union and abroad " should be energetically pursued. Shepilov

spoke on April 22nd, strongly in favour of a free and objective exchange of views and, in the field of literature and the arts, " ample scope for personal initiative and individual opinions."

Closer Contacts . . .

All these observations give rise to the hope that a strengthening of intellectual contacts between the Western world and the Soviet countries (including China) is not only possible, but will lead to further relaxation of tensions.

If the policy of liberalization conducted by the Soviet government in the cultural sphere is continued, or even reinforced, then one could expect that Soviet scholars will increasingly participate in international congresses and that this might lead further—possibly to exchange of students, and ultimately to an exchange of scientific papers. The author can report from his own experience that academic correspondence and exchange of professional papers is now possible with Warsaw University. It is noteworthy, also, that Yugoslav scholars have recently been allowed to inspect Soviet Research institutes and archives, while Finnish scholars now have access to the scientific institutes of Soviet Esthonia, and are permitted to make contact with their colleagues in these institutions. The importance of Yugoslavia and Finland as a link between the Soviets and the Western world has considerably increased.

The desire for closer contacts with the outside world is strong and widespread among the Soviet peoples. Lord Citrine expressed the view after his visit to Moscow, in May 1956, that this new atmosphere of readiness to make contact with foreigners is really the main feature of the post-Stalin era. I would suggest that the wish to establish such contacts may always have been there : the new development is the official approval of what was previously regarded as a crime against the State. The nightmare of oppression which made contacts with foreigners impossible, has been lifted from the Soviet State.

. . . and their Limitations.

In this new situation there should be no lack of response on the side of the West. Efforts to create an atmosphere of human understanding through the intensification of these personal contacts between the Soviets and the outside world should be furthered in every section of cultural life. At the same time, of course, it should be obvious that in making contact with our Soviet colleagues we must never abandon our own critical faculties and we must not be too sanguine in expecting quick results. It is worth remembering that Krushchev, in his major address at the 20th Party Congress, emphatically pronounced against ideological co-existence between East and West. " The thesis of co-existence, which in itself is perfectly correct, must not be extended to the sphere of ideologies. That is a disastrous error." At the same time, Krushchev

demanded that the struggle against " bourgeois ideology " should be pursued with undiminished energy.

Equally illuminating, in this respect, is Krushchev's call to Soviet art and literature " to advance in strength and mastery and take the lead in the world," and to be always " imbued with the spirit of the battle for Communism." In these formulations one can see, as before, the narrow outlook of a nationalist and party-political orientation of cultural life, both of which are far removed from the criteria of universal values which we try to follow in the West.

When the Polish party leader Berman spoke of the " climate of freedom," which he said was indispensible for all creative activity, he meant a rather different kind of freedom from the one which we know in the West. If anyone doubts this, he should study the pages of the *Literaturnaja Gazeta.* Under the title " The Free Literature of a Free People " we find on November 26th 1955, an article written in full conformity with the time-honoured doctrines of Communist literature and with due acknowledgement of Stalin's pronouncement on the role of the writer as " engineer of the human soul," and Lenin's doctrine of " conscious partyism " in all writing. This article constitutes a pathetic declaration of faith in the subservience of Soviet literature to the ruling party doctrines, which is said to be a legitimate source of pride. When people speak of the creative individuality of writers, says the paper, they are not by any means implying that there should be a " co-existence of different ideological creative methods."

A further statement of the views of this influential journal was published on December 4th, 1955, under the heading " The triumph of Freedom." The paper declares itself in favour of " the widest possible contact with all peoples, including those in the capitalist countries." At the same time, however, the " petty-bourgeois conceptions of freedom " are deprecated and compared unfavourably with Communist discipline and " partyism." Quoting the words of the writer Sholochov at the second Congress of Soviet writers, the paper subscribes to his declaration of faith in the party line : " Our enemies in foreign countries say that we write at the dictate of the party. But the facts are different : we write in accordance with the dictates of our own hearts, but our hearts belong to the party ! "

Here we find the limits which at the present time restrict the scope of cultural contact between West and East. It is undeniable, in view of these manifest limitations, that the concept of co-existence—which incidentally does not derive, in its political application, from Lenin, as people like to maintain in Moscow at the present time, but actually from Stalin—is itself subject to tactical dictates of party policy. Between the Western and Eastern conceptions of freedom there is a wide cleavage, which does not become any narrower by repeated invocations

of Lenin. The opinion which one occasionally hears voiced, that a gradual rise in the standard of living and an approach towards more settled conditions of administration might in due course lead to a relaxation of party pressures in the intellectual sphere, must be rejected in the light of Germany's experience in the last stages of the Hitler regime. The general style of the dictatorship became more humanized after the dictator had gone, but the system itself did not. It was not the climate that altered, but only the weather.

But it would be wrong to end on a negative note. The great fact of our time is that the political weather in the Soviet countries has, in fact, changed. And this, surely, in itself constitutes a tremendous step forward. What we must do now, is to welcome this brighter weather with open arms and exploit it with all possible diligence and energy. In the end, it may well be that an appeal to those individual hearts which Sholochov claims to be unreservedly at the disposal of the Communist party will prove more effective than any attempt to influence the system, as such, or its rulers. Co-existence between individual human beings, such as we may find through contact with our Soviet colleagues, is surely much more promising as a long term solution, than co-existence conceived merely as a diplomatic truce between two opposing systems, both of which remain impervious to each other's influence.

THE CONGRESS FOR CULTURAL FREEDOM . . .

. . . is the sponsoring body for the Committee on Science and Freedom. It was established in June, 1950, at a meeting in Berlin of writers, artists, philosophers and scientists from 21 countries. This first Congress for Cultural Freedom decided to set up a permanent organization to combat totalitarian threats to freedom of critical and creative thought wherever they might appear in the world.

Honorary Presidents :

Benedetto Croce†
John Dewey†
Karl Jaspers
Salvador de Madariaga
Jacques Maritain
Reinhold Niehbur
Earl Russell

President of the Executive Committee :

Denis de Rougemont

Secretary General : Nicolas Nabokov, 104, Boulevard Haussmann, Paris, 8.

Science and Freedom . . .

. . . the bulletin of the Committee on Science and Freedom, is obtainable free of charge, from the Joint Secretaries at Lime Cottage, 818, Wilmslow Road, Manchester, 20.

CONTENTS

Editor : George Polanyi

PRINTED IN ENGLAND BY J. B. FOY & CO. MANCHESTER, 1.