

Science and the News

Right Wingers Seem To Be Almost Everywhere: Notes on a Report to the Fund for the Republic

The wire services carried fairly lengthy accounts last week of a pamphlet claiming that the moderate conservatives of both major parties hold "the same beliefs" on basic issues as do those of the extreme right. The extremists, said the pamphlet, "differ only in their concern with fringe issues, in their manner of speaking, and in their sense of fair play. . . . The significance of recent developments is simply that in a time of deep crisis, the moderates are more willing to go along with, and be carried by, the extremists. The question raised by these trends is whether or not they will lead to a pattern set by Italy or Germany. . . . It would be a rash man indeed who could predict the outcome. . . ."

The view seemed a little unrealistic, coming in a week when the Democratic national chairman, presumably after taking some note of which way the political wind was blowing, kindly gave the Republican party all the credit for the right-wing phenomenon, and when Theodore McKeldin, of Maryland, found it prudent to make a public announcement of what a fine job he thought the President is doing. McKeldin is seeking the Republican nomination for governor.

The pamphlet, nevertheless, has attracted a good deal of attention, in part because of the current interest in reports on the right wing, but in part, also, because it carried the subtitle, "A Report to the Fund for the Republic." The Fund is a division of the Ford Foundation set up during McCarthy's heyday to finance "activities directed toward the elimination of restrictions on freedom of thought, inquiry, and expression in the United States, and the development of policies and procedures best adapted to protect these rights in the face of persistent international tensions."

The pamphlet is 46 pages long, with 17 additional pages of notes, and is called "The American Right Wing." It is actually a slight revision of a document sent to the Fund for the Republic in 1958 and published in 1960 as one of the University of Illinois Library School's Occasional Papers. One of the authors, Sarah M. Harris, a librarian at State University of Iowa, died in 1958. Its surviving author is Ralph E. Ellsworth, who was with Miss Harris at Iowa, but who is now director of libraries at the University of Colorado. Ellsworth is the author of several books on library administration.

"We have not been for or against this [right-wing] body of opinion," Ellsworth noted in his introduction to the pamphlet. Since the pamphlet ends with a suggestion that this body of opinion would lead to fascism if the trend the authors see were to continue, then the claim of impartiality would seem to mean that the authors are "neither for nor against" America going fascist. But the Fund is not really allowing its name to be used by people who are neutral on fascism.

In a recent conversation with a representative of *Science*, Ellsworth let it be known that he is actually against fascism, but just put the disclaimer in his introduction in order to help give the pamphlet a properly objective tone.

Samples

The body of the pamphlet, in large part, is simply a long series of samples and summaries of the writings of the fruitiest of the writers on the far fringes of the right, nearly all of it stuff that even Senator Goldwater would promptly denounce as preposterous: "Foreign Aid Is Not Christian"; "The key to survival is a thorough understanding of the Communist-Jewish conspiracy"; "Liberalism is treason"; and so on. The authors also find right wingers where they had not generally been suspected. The Council for Basic Education, according to the authors, "has

been cordially welcomed into the right-wing movement. . . . Both [groups] . . . distrust educational psychologists, and indeed the whole hierarchy of educationists, and believe that additional financing, federal, state, or other, would do nothing for the schools but perpetuate a bad situation."

No documentation is offered for the claim that the Council believes that "additional financing, federal, state, or other, would do nothing for the schools but perpetuate a bad situation."

The authors also assert (their italics) that "rightists . . . feel that *any* association with the Soviet government is appeasement. . . . They feel it is our bounden duty to withdraw recognition from this kangaroo government. . . . Up to the present time this has been the official position of both Dean Acheson and John Foster Dulles. . . ."

Identical Views

The authors report that "it may be (and has been) argued by many . . . that to find common objectives in the publications of the American Bar Association and of Gerald L. K. Smith's Christian Nationalist Crusade shows a singular lack of discrimination. Many right-wingers, in fact, have taken occasion to state their contempt for Smith's political opinions, though this has not caused them to reconsider any of their own identical views." No documentation is offered to explain what the authors consider to be "identical views" or "common objectives" in the publications of the Bar Association and the Christian Nationalist Crusade.

The prose of the pamphlet is extremely opaque, making it easy for a casual reader to slide over some of the most outrageous things the authors are saying. At one point there is a paragraph beginning "Add the editorials in the *Saturday Evening Post* . . ." and continuing with a long list of authors whose writings are to be added, including, for example, Richard Nixon. What are we adding all these people to? If we go back several paragraphs we find we are adding them to the "great many conservative writers [who] believe absolutely that this country is in the grip of a savage, ruthless conspiracy . . . [which] controls every single key point in American life. . . . Nor is this belief limited to irresponsible and unofficial spokesmen for the Right." Following this are three examples intended to document this claim, which in fact do nothing of the kind.

So not too surprisingly, by the time the reader is told to "add" the *Post* editorials, Nixon, and the rest, he has forgotten what the authors were talking about in the first place.

Added Up

"In summary," the authors say, "the American right wing may be said to include all those who share the conviction that the relation of government to the individual should be severely limited." The authors go on to specify the views of right wing, a term they use as synonymous with "conservative." There is room here for only a sample of the more peculiar views that the authors attribute to the right. Right wingers, say the authors, would demand "complete withdrawal of government from the regulation of industry," "outlaw full employment and collective bargaining," "ask complete withdrawal of the government from the supervision of health, education, and welfare and the immediate voiding of all programs dealing with social security," and "call for the persecution of ministers who preach the social gospel, and of teachers who recommend social planning, as communists and traitors."

"In the international field," the authors continue, right wingers would "put an immediate end to foreign aid and to participation of the United States in the United Nations." Ditto participation in NATO. "Break diplomatic relations with Israel." "Ask the UN to meet elsewhere and immediately raze the building." And "establish a kind of provisional citizenship for Negroes, Zionists, liberals, and all those whose families were naturalized less than two generations ago." Except for breaking relations with Israel and razing the United Nations building, none of these things seem to be fringe issues, so presumably the authors believe that moderate conservatives share these views. It is not clear in the text just who the authors regard as the moderate conservatives except that there are a great many of them. They do regard Barry Goldwater as an out-and-out conservative, which of course is just what he says he is. The only difficulty is that he advocates none of the things in the foregoing list, and the authors offer no evidence that he ever has advocated them. As for the moderate conservatives who the authors say "differ only in their concern with fringe issues, their manner of speaking, and their sense of fair play," they remain to be identified. The au-

thors, in their first footnote, explain that "the term *right* is used very simply as opposed to *left*, and the entire political spectrum is considered as divided between the two." In the same note they say "many gradations are distinguished within each division," but in the text the only gradation which is mentioned is that between the rightists, or conservatives proper, to whom are ascribed the whole catalog of views sampled above, and the moderate conservatives, who differ only in "their manner of speaking," and so forth. Presumably this moderate gradation would include people somewhere to the left of Goldwater but to the right of Kennedy, such as Eisenhower and Nixon.

In a telephone interview last week, Ellsworth readily confirmed that his use of "moderate conservative" did indeed refer to the people that it apparently referred to, that is, to people like Eisenhower and Nixon. He said he thought Kennedy shared some of these views as well, although not all of them. He and Miss Harris wrote the report, he says, because they felt the real meaning of the right-wing phenomenon, and the extent that it represented the views of moderates as well as extreme right wingers, was widely misunderstood and that the significance of the phenomenon was widely underestimated. He seemed a quiet-spoken, perfectly candid man who feels he has performed a useful public service. What is interesting in all this is not the demonstration that a liberal librarian is not necessarily immune to the kind of thinking that might lead a conservative businessman to believe that "except for fringe issues, etc." moderate liberals believe in the same things as communists. What is interesting is how the Fund for the Republic, a nonpartisan, tax-exempt, educational foundation, and a division of the Ford Foundation, came to appear to be its sponsor.

Background

Apparently the way it happened is this: When Ellsworth and Miss Harris were both at the University of Iowa, they had begun a collection of the literature of the far right. Most of it was received free from the sponsoring organizations, which were glad to have a library collection devoted to their views. The Fund for the Republic, through the University of Iowa, gave them a small grant, about \$4000, to support this work, which would provide researchers of whatever political viewpoint with a valuable central collection

of such material. The authors, having written their report on their own initiative, submitted it to the Fund as token repayment, in a sense, for the assistance they had received. The report received some private circulation, and in 1960 the Illinois Library School decided to publish it as one of its series of occasional papers. The report attracted no attention in the press, even though it carried the subtitle "A Report to the Fund for the Republic." This was partly because the earlier version did not contain the closing remarks "to bring the report up to date," asserting that moderate conservatives hold the same views as extremists on basic issues, or the suggestion that the country might be going fascist. But the report already did contain the other passages quoted here, making, without documentation, some extremely surprising assertions.

At no point, before or after publication, did the Fund give any indication that it regarded the use of its name as misleading. This year M. B. Schnapper, head of Public Affairs Press in Washington, asked Ellsworth for permission to reprint the report.

He says he was particularly attracted by the fact that it was, in his view, an important piece of work done in a sound and scholarly way. He says he probably could not have published it without a reasonable expectation that it would pay its way, but that the "Fund for the Republic" subtitle, although a factor in reaching the judgment that it would sell reasonably well, was not *the* factor. He said he thought the Fund's name would be "a lot more important from the point of view of respect for the report" than from the point of view of sales. He said he did not suggest removing the Fund's name, since the Fund had had no objection to the use of its name for the Illinois publication, and in addition knew of his plans to republish. He said that in view of this it would have been highly improper for him to remove the name, but that he had suggested to Ellsworth that the introduction should contain a clear statement that the report was *to* the Fund, not a report *of* the Fund, which it did. But in neither version is there anything suggesting that the report, in fact, was neither sponsored nor financed nor solicited by the Fund. The author, Ellsworth, says the use of the Fund's name might have been a mistake, but that the question of whether it should be included had never come up for discussion, either between him-

self and Schnapper or between himself and the Fund.

The press coverage, like the decision to republish, by no means depended solely on the use of the Fund's name. An Associated Press editor points out that the general interest in reporting on right wing extremists was an important factor. Both *Time* and *Newsweek* had run long attacks on the extremists the previous week. But the apparent sponsorship of the Fund, of course, was also a factor in the decision to cover the story at all and in deciding how much space to give it.

The effect of the use of the name might reasonably seem to have been likely to give the impression that the Fund had sponsored the report, with the implication that its officials had looked into Ellsworth's qualifications as a political analyst, had found him well qualified, and had financed his report. Since, as a practical matter, a foundation normally has a good idea of what sort of conclusions its grantee is likely to reach, particularly on such a widely discussed subject as Ellsworth's, there was the further implication that the Fund found his views to be sound, or at least sufficiently sound to deserve serious consideration.

At least until the report was printed, all of these assumptions were wholly unwarranted, since, as noted, the Fund had in fact neither sponsored nor financed the report. In these circumstances, the Fund's responsibility for the report would appear to have been really no more than if it had been sent in by a complete stranger. But once the report had been published, and republished, using the Fund's name, with at least its tacit approval, it might seem that the Fund had chosen to take, or accept, responsibility for the report.

But the Fund's officials have not taken this view, and do not feel the use of the Fund's name carries the implications suggested above.

Robert Hutchins, former chancellor of the University of Chicago and head of the Fund, says the report is solely what its title says, a report to the Fund, with no implication of Fund approval or sponsorship. So unless the Fund changes its mind, it seems that all anyone has to do who wishes to use the name of the Fund in this way, with whatever implications it may carry, is to subtitle his view "A Report to the Fund for the Republic," and remember to mail a copy before publication to the Fund for the Republic, Santa Barbara, Calif.—H.M.

Space Cooperation: Agreement at U.N. Leaves Out Some Key Points

From New York. The destructiveness of modern arms, and the long-standing antagonism of East and West, give special urgency to the exclusion of conflict in outer space. At the same time, the high cost of exploiting the peaceful uses of space, especially in communications and weather forecasting, makes cooperation economically desirable.

Of the two potentialities, military and peaceful, the former has little immediate significance, but in the long run it portends the greatest hazards. At present, space technology, despite its startling achievements, is rudimentary, and the United States and the Soviet Union are technologically incapable of clashing above the earth's atmosphere. But in not too many years, if present goals are achieved, the means will be developed to carry the present earthly tensions into the outer regions. Growing skills will make questions of celestial sovereignty a reality; orbiting launching platforms will be in existence, and these may be countered by missiles capable of destroying a target in space.

Against this background, considerable significance inevitably was attached to the Soviet Union's decision last week to end its 2-year boycott of the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. It did this when it abandoned its insistence on a troika—East-West-neutral—division of the committee and endorsed a resolution calling for the committee to meet by 31 March. The resolution, like a glimpse of blue sky in a rainy spell, was happily regarded as a propitious sign, and the tenor of most news accounts was that it portended the start of East-West space cooperation. This view was generally based on the resolution's exclusion of space from claims of national sovereignty. A closer examination, however, reveals that by its omissions and cautious phrasings, the resolution reflects vast impediments to keeping the cold war out of space.

The resolution generally follows the space proposals offered by President Kennedy in his U.N. address last September, but significantly makes no reference to his proposal for "prohibiting weapons of mass destruction in space or on celestial bodies." According to sources at the U.N., the United States did not raise this particular item during the week-long negotiations that produced the resolution, nor did the Soviet Union seek its inclusion. Japan and

Egypt made an attempt to bring it up for discussion, but neither the U.S. nor the Soviet Union—which are the only nations that count in space matters—showed any interest in it.

The closest the resolution came to requiring cooperation that has significance for military space efforts is in its provision calling for "states launching objects into orbit or beyond to furnish information promptly . . . for purposes of registration of launchings . . ." and "to provide for the exchange of such information relating to outer space activities as Governments may supply on a voluntary basis. . . ."

The provision, of course, leaves open the question of what information is to be included in the registration. If it is simply that a vehicle has been launched into space, the registry would tell no more than can now be determined by radar surveillance. If it is to go beyond that, and provide information about thrust and mission, there is no reason to believe that, in the present state of cold war tensions, the U.S. would find disclosure any more welcome than the Soviets would. As this nation's Midas and Samos reconnaissance systems approach operational use, the Air Force has become noticeably reticent about their performance. The Soviets, for their part, have never owned up to a major space failure. The energy that they put into exploiting space for prestige purposes does not suggest that they will come forward and provide unflattering information about themselves. The registration provision also raises the question of inspection, which has been the stumbling block throughout East-West disarmament negotiations. If the registry is to provide more than the announcement that a vehicle went aloft, who is to verify whether the additional information is indeed truthful?

In terms of readily attainable goals, the most significant part of the resolution deals with the establishment of cooperative space efforts in communications and weather forecasting. Since the United States has already invited other nations to partake of its achievements in these areas, the foundation for cooperation has already been laid. If the Soviet Union chooses to remain aloof, as it has from past U.S. efforts to foster East-West space cooperation, it will find the United States far outdistancing it in the good will and propaganda benefits to be derived from providing the world with some peaceful dividends of the space race.

The Soviet decision to end its 2-year