

7
Right then and there I swore off swearing what I wasn't, and every-
thing's been just fine. At home, that is. Elsewhere there
has, of course, been a certain unpleasantness.

The terrible thing that ~~has~~ happened to us during the oathing
fifties is that we have been so constantly engaged in swearing
what we aren't that we've altogether forgotten what we actually
are. The fevers of the cold war not only left us without identity,

They have
~~It~~ also rbbed us of our original sense of moral purpose.

Thus decent men and women, *persons* men and women of intelligence, good will,
and high *aspiration* hopes--- having subscribed to the expediency of the
negative oath, have *been compelled to* accepted expediency as a way of life.

~~And~~ The expediency runs in this fashion:

(1) Unless the Federal Government assumes more responsibility
for public health, the nation will be fatally weakened in its
struggle against Communism.

(2) Or, the Walter-MacCarran act must be repealed because it
provides Communists with anti-American propaganda.

(3) Or, ~~Bad housing programs~~ slums breed communism, hence we
must have an adequate housing program.

(4) Or, The American Negro must ~~be~~ be granted ~~full~~ complete
equality under the law, ~~or~~ else we shall lose our ideological
struggle with the Kremlin.

And, of course, you see what happens. No longer do we demand
social progress because it is good, because it is just, because
without it millions of our people will suffer, and their dignity
as human beings will be degraded. Not at all. We demand
progress, not because it is right, but because it is expedient.

And so long as a negative-oathed generation generation persists
in negative action toward objectives negatively stated and imorally
desired---just so long ^{will} ~~shall~~ they fail themselves, and the purposes
for which this nation was founded.

negative oathed generation
negative oathed generation

the negative with

Actually, the demand for compulsory revelation, and the consequent ~~in~~ censorship and suppression of ideas is nothing new, and certainly ~~it is not unique to the modern world.~~ Since the time of Socrates, writers and teachers have been scuttling across national borders with the police hot on their trails. And always they have found the police most active in times of war, cold war, or national turmoil.

Dante, Voltaire, Rousseau, Defoe, ~~Mary~~ Victor Hugo, John Bunyan, ~~Dostoyevski~~, Dostoyevski, Heinrich Mann, Lion Feuchtwanger, Bertrand Russell---the list of literary jailbirds or fugitives is endless. Indeed, there are times in history when the natural residence of the artist, the writer, and the teacher appears to be exile.

Neither can it be said that ~~the~~ censorship and suppression ~~of~~ *are* ideas is unique to ~~any particular form of government.~~ *Probably* ~~the~~ *TO OUR OWN COUNTRY, the English* ~~the~~ *OR OUR PARTICULAR FORM OF GOVT. Government* England today, in terms of freedom of expression, is probably the most liberal country in the world.

Yet only 35 years ago the British saw fit to send Bertrand Russell to prison for two years, and ~~even now~~ only in the last year have they begun to weaken the ~~control~~ power of ~~control~~ censorship over the theatre which provided Shaw with material for some of his liveliest vituperations. *the French Republic,* In France, the citadel of European freedom, the stresses of the Algerian war have produced ~~control~~ *very* occasional confiscation of whole issues of the press, and the suppression of entire books.

Yes Neither has ~~the Soviet Union under~~ socialism been able to solve the problem of the artist ~~in~~ and his ideas in relation to the authority of the state. *the SA has* They, too, have imprisoned writers and suppressed books, ~~and the fury of the heretic~~ and ~~the~~ fury against the heretic has left its imprint ~~upon~~