

(continued from previous page)

protest and revolt, and it is stultifying to celebrate the rebels of the past—Jefferson and Paine, Emerson and Thoreau—while we silence the rebels of the present.

Those who would impose upon us a new concept of loyalty not only assume that this is possible but have the presumption to believe that they are competent to write the definition. We are reminded of Whitman's defiance of the "never-ending audacity of elected persons." Who are those who would set the standards of loyalty? They are Rankins and Bilbos, officials of the D.A.R. and the Legion and the N.A.M., Hearsts and McCormicks. May we not say of Rankin's harangues on loyalty what Emerson said of Webster at the time of the Seventh of March speech: "The word honour in the mouth of Mr. Webster is like the word love in the mouth of a whore."

What do men know of loyalty who make a mockery of the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights, whose energies are dedicated to stirring up race and class hatreds, who would strait-jacket the American spirit? What, indeed, do they know of America—the America of Sam Adams and Tom Paine, of Jackson's defiance of the Court and Lincoln's celebration of labour, of Thoreau's essay on Civil Disobedience and Emerson's championship of John Brown, of the America of the Fourierists and the Come-Outers, of cranks and fanatics, of socialists and anarchists? Who among American heroes could meet their tests, who would be cleared by their committees? Not Washington, who was a rebel. Not Jefferson, whose motto was "rebellion to tyrants is obedience to God." Not Garrison, who publicly burned the Constitution; or Wendell Phillips, who spoke for the underprivileged everywhere and counted himself a philosophical anarchist; not Seward of the Higher Law or Sumner of racial equality. Not Lincoln, who admonished us to have malice towards none, charity for all; or Wilson, who warned that our flag was "a flag of liberty of opinion as well as of political liberty"; or Justice Holmes, who said that our Constitution is an experiment and that while that experiment is being made "we should be eternally vigilant against attempts to check the expression of opinions that we loathe and believe to be fraught with death."

More Practical Objections

There are further and more practical objections against the imposition of fixed concepts of loyalty or tests of disloyalty. The effort is itself a confession of fear, a declaration of insolvency. Those who are sure of themselves do not need reassurance, and those who have confidence in the strength and the virtue of America do not need to fear either criticism or competition.

Nor are we left to idle conjecture in this matter; we have had experience enough. Let us limit ourselves to a single example, one that is wonderfully relevant. Back in 1943 the House Un-American Activities Committee, deeply disturbed by alleged disloyalty among Government employees, wrote a definition of subversive activities and proceeded to apply it. The definition was admirable, and no one could challenge its logic or its symmetry.

Subversive activity derives from conduct intentionally destructive of or inimical to the Government of the United States—that which seeks to undermine its institutions, or to distort its functions, or to impede its projects, or to lessen its efforts, the ultimate end being to overturn it all.

Surely anyone guilty of activities so defined deserved not only dismissal but

punishment. But how was the test applied? It was applied to two distinguished scholars, Robert Morss Lovett and Goodwin Watson, and to one able young historian, William E. Dodd, Jr., son of our former Ambassador to Germany. Of almost three million persons employed by the Government, these were the three whose subversive activities were deemed the most pernicious, and the House cut them off the payroll. The sequel is familiar. The Senate concurred only to save a wartime appropriation; the President signed the Bill under protest for the same reason. The Supreme Court declared the whole business a "bill of attainder" and therefore unconstitutional. Who was it, in the end, who engaged in "subversive activities"—Lovett, Dodd and Watson, or the Congress which flagrantly violated Article One of the Constitution?

Finally, disloyalty tests are not only futile in application, they are pernicious in their consequences. They distract attention from activities that are really disloyal, and silence criticism inspired by true loyalty. That there are disloyal elements in America will not be denied, but there is no reason to suppose that any of the tests now formulated will ever be applied to them. It is relevant to remember that when Rankin was asked why his Committee did not investigate the Ku Klux Klan he replied that the Klan was not un-American, it was American! America was born of revolt, flourished on dissent, became great through experimentation.

Independence was an act of revolution; republicanism was something new under the sun; the federal system was a vast experimental laboratory. Physically Americans were pioneers; in the realm of social and economic institutions, too, their tradition has been one of pioneering. From the beginning, intellectual and spiritual diversity have been as characteristic of America as racial and linguistic. The most distinctively American philosophies have been transcendentalism—which is the philosophy of the Higher Law, and pragmatism—which is the philosophy of experimentation and pluralism. These two principles are the very core of Americanism; the principle of the Higher Law, or of obedience to the dictates of conscience rather than of statutes, and the principle of pragmatism, or the rejection of a single good and of the notion of a finished universe. From the beginning Americans have known that there were new worlds to conquer, new truths to be discovered. Every effort to confine Americanism to a single pattern, to constrain it to a single formula, is disloyalty to everything that is valid in Americanism.

Fashions for Men

IN London's famous Victoria and Albert Museum an exhibition of male costumes during the past 600 years is being shown. This gay and colourful display brings sighs of relief or groans of envy from the men who see what their ancestors wore, though perhaps the relief outweighs the envy, for what modern man would be happy wearing a wide-brimmed, plumed hat or broad starched ruff as he battled with conditions of modern transport? Robert Baker spoke about the exhibition in his "Letter from London" broadcast in the BBC's General Overseas Service and said, "I gathered one rather interesting point from the combined illustrations and actual clothes which make up the exhibition, and that is, that in each period dress becomes standardised until the younger, more dashing male thinks out a sports dress. In its turn, the sports dress becomes the formal attire."



"Oh, Mum—
S'pose your face froze!"



BABY: Why, Mum! Don't you like being me—and wearing my pretty bonnet?

MUM: Frankly, no! I'm learning fast—that in a baby's life, clothes are just one more thing to bother his skin and make him uncomfortable!

BABY: Carry that a step further, Mum. Doesn't it suggest something you could do for me? Like maybe a little attention with Johnson's Baby Cream and Johnson's Baby Powder?

MUM: Angel, I've been a delinquent mamma! Gracious—a baby's poor little skin certainly does need something to protect it. What do I do?

BABY: Now you're talking! First smooth me where necessary with Johnson's pure, gentle Baby Cream, after my bath. Use some more when you change me—to help prevent what Doctor calls "urine irritation"!

MUM: As good as done. Then what?

BABY: You know how chafes and prickles bother me when I get warm and perspire? Chase 'em—with cool sprinkles of Johnson's Baby Powder... Well, Mum—that's the story!



MUM: Let's hurry the happy ending! Off to the store for Johnson's!



* Sterilised for your protection in accordance with the regulations.

Safe for Baby—Safe for You
* Johnson's Baby Powder
Johnson's Baby Cream
Johnson's Baby Soap

Johnson & Johnson
(NEW ZEALAND) LIMITED

N.Z. Distributors: Potter & Birks (N.Z.) Ltd., 14 Lower Federal St., Auckland.