



## Abba Hillel Silver Collection Digitization Project

Featuring collections from the Western Reserve Historical Society and  
The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives

### **MS-4787: Abba Hillel Silver Papers, 1902-1989.**

Series IV: Sermons, 1914-1963, undated.

---

Reel  
164

Box  
59

Folder  
915

Taking stock of 1953, 1953.



836

TAKING STOCK OF 1953

December 27, 1953

My dear Friends, considering the kind of a world in which we have been living the last few decades, the year 1953 may be said to be or to have been a better sort of a year, a quieter year, and a more hopeful year. If only for the fact that the world situation did not worsen during the year. I believe too that it has slightly improved. In a war which had dragged on to an unhappy stalemate for nearly four years and armistice negotiations which dragged on seemingly interminably for eighteen months, a truce was finally agreed upon during 1953 and fighting ceased. Negotiations are now proceeding, likewise at a snail's pace, with frequent interruptions, the same negotiations are now proceeding for an agreement looking towards a permanent peace settlement.

Now we have not heard, of course, the last of Korea, but at least the fighting has stopped. Americans are no longer dying on far-off battlefields in a war into which our government blundered and for which it was not prepared.

The Eisenhower administration is to be congratulated for having achieved the Korean truce, for having begun the liquidation of this unhappy and unsuccessful and, in life and treasures, exceedingly costly episode in American diplomatic and military history.

We sincerely hope that they will be proved right who argue that our intervention in Korea, even though it ended in a stalemate, will yet have a salutary effect in discouraging future Communist expansionist adventures in other parts of the world. Only time will tell.

We are still involved in a war in that part of the world - in Indo-China; not with our soldiers, but with our resources, our equipment, our ammunition, our military advisers, and with our vast financial support. From present indications, the Indo-China war is a losing war also, a losing war principally for France, a war which is very unpopular in France itself. This Indo-China war has also dragged out now for



for nearly eight years, and the drain upon us has been very large, and the results here again are likely to be exceedingly negative. France is fighting Communists in Indo-China, but France is also fighting in Indo-China to safeguard her own colonial and imperial interests, and colonialism and imperialism are rather out-dated in the world today. The issue there is, therefore, not clear cut, and our backing France and Indo-China makes our own position in the eyes of the free world extremely ambiguous. The United Nations is not a party to this war in Indo-China, as it was in Korea. Perhaps the year 1954 will do for Indo-China what 1953 did for Korea.

But passing from fighting to statesmanship, American diplomacy has scored some very notable victories during the year, at least to the extent of recapturing initiative and leadership in the conduct of our own foreign affairs. A situation which had been hopelessly frozen for years with no progress whatsoever registered has been unfrozen by the efforts of our government. And movement and action and courage seem to have replaced in the year 1953 a dead and dangerous inaction, an inertia, a timidity. As a result, a Big Four Ministers Conference is now scheduled to be held the latter part of January to discuss the outstanding problems which the second World War left unsolved - the problem of German unification, the problem of an Austrian peace, similar problems which, because they have remained unsolved, have been a source of endless and dangerous tensions in the heart of Europe.

An even greater diplomatic victory in 1953 towards the close of the year was scored by American diplomatic leadership in the unprecedented address and proposals which President Eisenhower made before the Assembly of the United Nations, proposing a world atomic pool for peace. Here was a startlingly new formula to get out of the impasse in which the world found itself for some years now, a formula which would bring the Soviet Union and the free world together in the pursuit of common paths, common objectives for the benefit of the whole of mankind - a formula which would find the way



for the two great parts of mankind to live together in the one world and on this one globe.

This was the kind of leadership for which the world has been waiting - courageous, constructive, far-visioned. Whether the Soviet Union wanted this kind of a proposal - and professional anti-Sovietites announced in advance that the Soviet Union would not accept the President's proposal to sit down and talk it over and the first reactions in the Communist press were, as you recall, likewise negative - it seems, however, that if their first reactions were negative, the leaders of the Soviet Union thought better of it after a second thought and realized how much it would lose in the trust and confidence of their followers the world over if they rebuffed this proposal of the President of the United States. And so they officially agreed to these secret conferences to discuss the possibility of pooling the resources of mankind, the thought of mankind, whereby this amazing new source of power could be put to the use not of war but of peace and the improvements of the lot of men everywhere.

This is what we have been waiting for, regardless of what the ultimate outcome of it will be. We had hoped for this kind of leadership in spite of the distrust which naturally exists. We can take care of this distrust quite as readily as the Russians! And in spite of possible rebuffs, the dignity of the American people and its national pride in the last analysis do not depend upon the Kremlin. They depend upon ourselves, upon the sincerity and the nobility of our purposes and our role in the world. We ought never to permit distrust or the fear of rebuffs to discourage us over and over again to make the effort to bring about a peaceful solution of all the outstanding problems in the world.

Doors have now been opened. Where these doors will lead to, nobody can foretell. One need not be too optimistic and one need not be too pessimistic, but surely we are no longer staring at a blank wall and we no longer find ourselves in a hopeless cul-de-sac. There are possibilities opening up. We should explore these possibilities



with utmost courage and confidence, and with caution, of course, to the utmost.

Our program for the European Defense Community which was to embrace western Germany as a military bulwark against Soviet aggression has not fared well during 1953. Little progress has been made in that direction. France and Italy have not yet ratified the European defense Community program. Nor for that matter have Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxemburg given their final approval. The only country which has given final approval has been western Germany, and there too the action of the government awaits a court test.

Our government has become quite impatient with this delay. One can understand its impatience. It has poured so much energy and thought and money into NATO and into this Defense Community that it wishes to see the consummation of its effort in concrete commitments on the part of the nations in western Europe. Very recently our Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, has warned the French that unless they acted without much further delay, America might be compelled to take what he called an "agonizing re-appraisal" of the whole situation with a clear implication that military aid to Europe and perhaps other forms of aid would have to be reduced drastically.

Now France has been afraid of a militarily renascent Germany, and one can understand this fear. Twice within this century France has been ravaged by a militaristic Germany and its national life brought almost to the brink of total annihilation. She is afraid of a rearmed Germany. She doesn't trust Germany, inside or outside the NATO arrangement. You may recall that I have spoken on several occasions about the dangers of rearming Germany. I have spoken on it again recently. Perhaps no real agreement with our allies and especially with France will be reached until after the Big Four Conference which is scheduled now for next month when the whole issue of Germany - if there is to be a united Germany, whether there is to remain a divided Germany, if there is to be a militarized Germany, or a neutralized Germany - this basic issue - underlying everything in Europe - will be thoroughly canvassed and perhaps some



agreement reached.

My own thought is that we ought not to become too impatient with a tried and trusted ally like France, which is the bulwark and citadel of human freedom in Europe today; it has been for the last 150 years. In spite of the difficulties under which France operates at the moment, in spite of the lack of strong leadership in its political life and of any firm direction, France still remains our natural ally - in spirit, in sympathies, in convictions, in ideals - our ally. We ought not to become too impatient with France and go overboard for a Germany which we had to fight twice in the last few decades, the last World War only eight years ago. Many Americans seem to have forgotten this fact. Pressures at this time, threats at this time, do not help us to bring about a permanent arrangement which we are seeking for Europe and for mankind.

1953, my dear friends, saw recorded the inauguration of President Eisenhower as President of the United States. It also recorded the death of Stalin. In our country a new administration came into office and an old administration which had been 20 years in office went out peacefully by the will and the order of a free electorate of American citizens. No one was purged, no one was shot, and this process of one party coming into office and another party going out of office has been going on in American life for over 175 years. If there could be any greater tribute to the strength of democracy, I don't know of any, and if there is need for any fact to strengthen our confidence in democracy which seems to have been so severely shaken not merely by the propaganda from abroad but by some of our own well-intentioned patriots here at home. This one fact alone ought to reassure us American democracy is sturdy, strong, can withstand storms and endure.

When Stalin died, that was not the case. You may recall that when Stalin came into dictatorship of the Soviet following the death of Lenin, a bitter struggle within the party took place which was attended by purges, by blood-baths, by assassination, by trials and conspiracies all through the years, off and on, in which the oldest



revolutionists who achieved the Bolshevik revolution were nearly all executed and hundreds of thousands of people were put to death.

And with the death of Stalin and the elevation of Malenkov to premiership, the story seems to be repeating itself again. Powerful Lavrenti Beria, head of the Secret Police and six others of cabinet rank, topmen of the Soviet system, were charged with high treason, condemned by secret tribunal, and executed. This will probably not be the end of the story. This procedure is classical for all dictatorship, has to be; there is no way out for them. At each crucial turn of events that is bound to happen, because if the policy pursued proves to be unsuccessful, not only must the policy be changed but its proponents must go, must be liquidated because a dictatorship cannot tolerate an enduring opposition. The charges made against these people who have to go are inconsequential; they just have to go! They just have to be removed! And this is the Achilles heel of all dictatorships. This is what finally destroys them.

The uprisings in Eastern Germany in 1953 against the Communist regime are also significant. It is in these satellite countries on the periphery where the first crack in this empire which Muscovite Communism has built up will become visible. Russians are not loved there. They are regarded as "Invaders and Conquerors" as they have been regarded by those peoples in Poland, in Hungary, in Lithuania, in eastern Germany; elsewhere for generations and centuries there are deep-lying historical resentments and hostilities. When in this monolithic system which has been built up the first crack appears, it will be in one or another of these peripheral countries around Russia, and that includes also China.

A good deal of public attention was given in 1953 by the American people to the exposures of Communists in government. A bitter controversy developed in the last few months over the criticism of Attorney General Brownell of former President Truman's



handling of the Harry Dexter White case. The question of the methods employed by our Congressional investigation committees in assessing Communist penetration in government and elsewhere was hotly debated by the American people and is still a subject for hot debate. Senator McCarthy came in for considerable - and to him I am sure most welcome - publicity during 1953. I have spoken of the matter time and again here and elsewhere in sharing with you my reactions and my thinking on the subject. I do not wish to repeat them this morning. I do wish to read a letter, however, which came to my attention within the week - a letter published in the Harvard Alumni Bulletin. I read it to you because I believe it does sum up the thinking of most every fair-minded American on this controversy.

"I write as a lawyer, an American of Irish descent, and a Catholic. I have just returned from Senator McCarthy's hearing at our Federal Building. If ever there were a man devoid of refinement, or the slightest spiritual sensitivity, it is Mr. McCarthy. Unquestionably, we have here a low-grade bully of the storm-trooper type with all the makings of a Hitler, a Goering, a Stalin, or a Mussolini. With a jerk of the thumb, an insolent tone, a cruel mien, occasionally marked by a sadistic smile, this arrogant man kept saying, "Put the man out, Marshal, put the man out," all witnesses being treated contemptuously. So much so that one, indeed, did have to ask one's self, "Is this the United States or is it Russia?"

Is there no quiet, patient, sober, hardworking leadership today in either party which can handle the Communist menace without resorting to Communist tactics, or, to put it more simply, without resorting to evil? This is meant to be no defense of the criminal neglect of ex-President Truman, as evidenced by the testimony of Mr. Hoover of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, nor of Communists who, equally with Senator McCarthy, would degrade the judicial process and destroy America. But I do now believe that Senator McCarthy is the greater menace because he has the capacity to stir the unruly passions and lead the mob to violence. Here is a man who bears the most careful watching by all who are interested in the preservation of this nation of ours.



Indeed, I fear that unless this man is stopped, America will live to regret his emergence on the national scene. The Communists, I believe, we can now handle. Mr. McCarthy, I fear, we may not be able to handle."

This is signed by a man named Mark J. Dalton, Boston, '41 Harvard.

And now we are on the threshold of 1954. And the events of 1954 are not within our provision or to a large degree in our control, but we may express our hope for a continuing and increasing peace movement in the world in 1954. Let us be thinking more about peace and less about war. Let our psychology be more the psychology of peace rather than of war. There are people who do not want us to think in terms of peace, especially when the budget time comes around, when military budgets are to be voted by the Congress of the United States. Let us hope that the conferences which are scheduled will yield some measure of understanding and concord. May it be a year of increasing confidence and increasing loyalty to our democratic institutions and to our democratic procedures without which there are no democratic institutions left. Institutions are safeguarded by law. If the processes of law are ignored, the institutions which they are intended to serve begin to collapse.

Let us hope for the sustained well-being, stability, and the prosperity of our nation during the coming year. 1953, I read, has been a record year for production in our country and for the size of income of our people. This is something to be profoundly grateful to, and we have not been selfish in the enjoyment of that income. We have shared it generously with the rest of mankind. One of the most magnificent and noble qualities of the American people is its generosity of heart. May it never fail us.

our adjustments in our economic life are now going on, but here and there, there may be a leveling out process especially as a result of cuts which are likely to take place during the coming year in defense expenditures and in other matters related to army budgets. The American people ought to welcome such a leveling-off process if the peak rests upon military budgets. Much of the money which



our government will save during the coming year if it finds it possible to reduce its military outlays may well be channeled into productive and constructive services to the American people, to raise the standard of large sections of our population where improvement is clearly needed. And so, good friends, I face the coming year as I believe we all have the right to face with a measure of hope, confidence; our political leaders are pointing to a new road, a more promising road; world tensions seem to be somewhat relaxed and perhaps the gathering forces of good will and the constructive thinking of men and women everywhere will begin to assert themselves more forcibly and more determinably during the coming year. At least let that be our hope and our prayer.





1) Considering the kind of world - 1953 - a better and quicker <sup>happy</sup> ~~year~~ <sup>year</sup>.  
The world situation did not worsen - it slightly improved.

In a war which dropped on for 4 years - and to an unhappy  
stalemate  $\frac{3}{4}$  yrs - and another negotiation which dropped  
in seemingly interminably <sup>18 mos</sup> - a Truce was finally agreed  
to - and fighting ceased.

Negotiations are now proceeding - <sup>efforts</sup> at a <sup>with proper interest</sup> ~~stale~~ <sup>peace</sup> - for an  
agreement looking towards a permanent peace settlement.

We have not heard the last of Korea - but, at least, the  
fighting has stopped - Americans are no longer dying  
for - 7/8 battle-fields in a war into which are sent.  
Random and for which I was not prepared.

The Eisenhower Administration is to be congratulated for having  
relieved the Korean Truce, and begun the liquidation  
of this unhappy and unnecessary <sup>in life and</sup> ~~war~~ <sup>history</sup>  
episode in our diplomatic and military history.  
We hope that they will be proved right who argue that  
the intervention in Korea - even tho it ended in a  
stalemate - will have a salutary effect in discouraging  
future communist expansionist adventures in other  
parts of the world. Only time will tell.

2) We are still involved in a war in that part of the world - in  
Indo-China, not with an enemy, but with our  
resources, our equipment and ammunition, our military  
advisers, and our vast financial support.



From present indications it is a losing war for France - ~~but~~ <sup>unpopular</sup> it has dropped out for ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> drain upon us is <sup>very</sup> large - and the results are again likely to be negative.

France is fighting consciously in Indo-China, but also to save France her colonial, unusual interests <sup>and</sup> the issue is not clear-cut - and in an epoch France is advancing - our position in the eyes of the free world appears ambiguous. The UN is not a party to this war in Indo-China, as it was in Korea.

3/ Passing from fighting to statesmanship - Amer. diplomacy has scored some notable victories - at least in re- capturing initiative and leadership in the conduct of the war, affairs.

A situation which had been frozen - and no progress reported - has been unfrozen by the effort of Angart. Movement, action, courage have been replaced by inaction, hesitation, timidity, and dangerous inaction - inertia, timidity.

As a result - a Big Four Foreign Ministers Conference will be held the latter part of Jan. - to discuss German unification and an European peace - the serious and other problems which have remained unresolved since the end of the W. War - + have been the same problems which have been in the heart of Europe.



- 4/1. an even greater diplomatic victory - secured - U.N. <sup>unprecedented</sup> ~~Establishment~~ 13  
- a world atmosphere for peace - a new formula  
to bring Soviet & the world together - to find ways of  
- this was the kind of leadership - Encourages - Constructive  
for - welcomed  
- Whether the Soviet wanted - and preference of anti-Soviet  
announced in advance that it would - and just  
reaches in Com. press - actually negative -  
- That better if it <sup>shows</sup> ~~saw~~ what it would lose - and  
agreed to accept superiorities -

(a) This is what we had always looked for - here  
mind the distrust - we can talk can, avoids as  
well as Russian. - here mind the Beliefs -  
- Our dignity & nat. pride are not dependent on the  
knowledge - They are deep within our conscience -  
the <sup>strength</sup> nobility of our purpose -

(b) Doors have now been opened. When they will lead to - no  
one can tell - But we are not staring at a  
blank wall - and trapped in end-de-sue -

5/1. Our program for the Eur. Defense Com. - involving an -  
broad Western front - has not and will during 1953.  
little progress has been made. France and Italy have not



get satisfied it. We have Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg<sup>(4)</sup>  
under their final approval. And West Germany has signed it fully  
approved - but now awaits a court test.

Our Govt. has become impatient with the delay. Very recently  
Dulles warned the French that unless they approved without  
much further delay, the Am. Govt. might be compelled to take an  
"aggressive reappraisal" of its entire position in Europe - re-  
direction, military aid to Europe. -

France fears a militarily resurgent Germany. - Talbot -  
- I have frequently spoken on several occasions about the  
danger, rearming Germany.

Perhaps no real agreement with our allies. + esp. France -  
will be reached until after the meeting, the Big 4 -  
when the issue, Germany - United, divided, unified,  
or neutralized will be thoroughly canvassed.

Let us not become impatient with a friend of the ally  
France - a bulwark / freedom in Europe. ~~but at present looks like a~~  
over-board for a Germany when we have had to fight  
twice in 2 world wars - the second as recently as 8 yrs  
ago. - Have we forgotten - already?

6). 1953 records the inauguration of Pres Eisenhower as - ?.  
It also recorded the death, Stalin.



A new Admin. came in - An old Admin. - 20 yrs in office - went out -  
- peacefully - at the will, the a free electorate - no one was prejud  
the one was shot - this has been going on for 175 yrs. in this  
free democracy - An amazing fulfill to the strength, democracy.

(a) When Stalin, came into dictatorship of Soviet, after both Levin,  
a little struggle, within party, took place, - attended, by  
hunger, blood, both, persecutions, chairs and surprises  
in which the oldest persecutions were legislated - 100,000 -

(b) With the death of Stalin - and the election of Nikolai  
to friendship - the story is repeating one of Laurenty  
Beria - head, Secret Police, and six members other  
high in of calmest rank, were charged with high treason, -  
condemned by secret tribunal and executed.

(c) this, will probably not be, the end, it - this procedure  
is classic for dictatorship - at each crucial turn, events.

(1) And this is their Belshazzar's feast!

(2) The uprising in East Germany of the communist regime  
during the war - as also significant - It is in the Soviet  
countries - where the Communist empire will first begin to  
crack - Russians are not loved there - "Invaders of Europe!" -  
long historical hostilities - When any crack develops  
in the monolith - it will quickly develop in these  
peripheral regions - including China -



7/ A good deal of public attention was given by an (6)  
people to the (exposed) Communists in government. (A little)  
confidence developed over Attorney General Brownell's criticism  
[Mr. Truman in the handling of the Harry Dexter White  
case -

The question of the methods employed by  
Comm. penetration in fact - and whether - was hotly debated  
Sen. McCarthy - came in for considerable - and to him, I am  
very much welcome, publicity -

I have spoken of this matter from the Temple pulpit and  
elsewhere - and have shared with you my ~~own~~ readers -

I do not wish to repeat (Read title)

8/ 1954. 14th -

- continuing and increasing peace - in world.
- continuing ~~conference~~ <sup>solid</sup> ~~covered~~ <sup>covered</sup> - U.S.
- increasing confidence + loyalty to an Amer. institution  
And an Amer. procedure -
- sustained well-being <sup>and</sup> <sup>prosperity</sup> at home. - 1953

was a record year for production - size & income - Real was  
passed during 1954 - adjustments - swelling out - ~~to~~ Arms  
cuts - defense expenditures -



# Letters

## Mr. Pusey & Religious Faith

To the Editor of the BULLETIN:

It has not been unexpected that the various cults and religious interests in our country have tried to take advantage of the present widespread fear of communism by promoting a return to supernaturalism and superstition, or, if you will, a return to organized religion. Does Mr. Pusey want Harvard men, in reaction to one cloudy philosophy, to turn into the waiting arms of others? . . .

It is possible that President Pusey is employing the word religion in terms of personal faith in one's self, community, country, and in humanity. If so, it would be well to carefully distinguish the two. Religion may bring to mind sacrifices and goodwill; it also reminds one of offensive crusades, wars in the name of God, heretics, inquisitions, book-burning, censorship, banners of God, and thought-control for the benefit of ecclesiastics and the propagation of one or another of the religious establishments. It appears to many that it is hardly accurate to associate practising religion with a true philosophical belief in our Creator. God and Christ are often merely used to benefit the profitable employment of clergymen.

Mr. Pusey may be thinking along the lines of President Eliot when he speaks of the "love of truth and passion for seeking it." Does President Pusey support present day religion, or does he hope for a better, future philosophy outlined by his predecessor?

I would entirely agree with President Pusey if he were in reality thinking about beliefs that place supreme importance, not on mystical acts and prayers to a totally unknown power, but on "increased knowledge and good works." Again, this is not clear from his text, which makes one wonder if he may only be trying to throw in the life-raft to a sinking Divinity School.

Christianity, like other religions, big and small, embodies many very noble and excellent concepts. However, christianity's record, and the record of the so-called Christian world, does not stand up even under a most casual investigation. We have produced among ourselves the most savage wars, burnings, destructions, weapons, and bloodshed the world has ever seen. If we admit that organized religion produces more ill-will than it cures, more persecution than it prevents, that it sheds more blood than it saves, that it retards civilization more than it advances it, we may stand on firm ground and improve the ills we suffer, make greater our institutions of learning and culture, and evolve a set of beliefs and principles based on reason, not religion.

The sober thinker realizes that wars are

caused and cured by man. Neither Hannibal nor Hitler worried about the prayers for peace in their enemies' camp. Wars begin when the aggressor sets the timetable. Peace is made by troops, not churchgoers. The side that wins may call it God's victory. Whether you do or don't depends on what side you are on. The United Nations will be made workable by humanity, not by gods beyond the skies. Goodness does not come from sitting in the front pew Sunday morning, but by intelligence, honesty, and work. You cannot frighten modern man by visions of hell. The 20th century world of rockets and atomic energy cannot be governed in terms of this or that antique religion. In spite of ourselves, the world moves forward. Man will continue to discard the old, the superstitious, and replace the worn-out and unworkable with the new. . .

Let us hope that Harvard's fine name as a bastion of free inquiry and knowledge will not become warped in any revivalist action. Harvard should march to the future, and not, save for historical reasons, stumble backwards into the superstitious past. The ignorant and timid may still need the comfort of a bright heaven and the consoling thought that their church knows the unknowable, but I doubt if most Harvard men need such props.

We cannot talk about immortality in any religion without thinking about the many beliefs that have been cast aside by advancing mankind. If Greek, Egyptian, and Roman creeds are outdated, perhaps ours are outdated. Christian, Moslem, Jewish, and Buddhist saints, gods and prophets are just as susceptible to replacement as their ancestors. If humanity, which still does not know much about its own body, would waste less time on guessing about its Creator, and more on improving itself, it would be in a better position to throw off the cloaks of mysticism. Let Harvard, at least, show the way and lead the new, not follow the old. . .

F. J. ORDWAY '49

Paris

## The Mess, Etc.

To the Editor of the BULLETIN:

I write as a lawyer, an American of Irish descent, and a Catholic. I have just returned from Senator McCarthy's hearing at our Federal Building. If ever there were a man devoid of refinement, or the slightest spiritual sensitivity, it is Mr. McCarthy. Unquestionably, we have here a low-grade bully of the storm-trooper type with all the makings of a Hitler, a Goering, a Stalin, or a Mussolini. With a jerk of the thumb, an insolent tone, a cruel mien, occasionally marked by a sadistic smile, this arrogant man kept say-

ing, "Put the man out, Marshal, put the man out," all witnesses being treated contemptuously. So much so that one, indeed, did have to ask one's self, "Is this the United States or is it Russia?"

Is there no quiet, patient, sober, hard-working leadership today in either party which can handle the Communist menace without resorting to Communist tactics, or, to put it more simply, without resorting to evil? This is meant to be no defense of the criminal neglect of ex-President Truman, as evidenced by the testimony of Mr. Hoover of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, nor of Communists who, equally with Senator McCarthy, would degrade the judicial process and destroy America. But I do now believe that Senator McCarthy is the greater menace because he has the capacity to stir the unruly passions and lead the mob to violence. Here is a man who bears the most careful watching by all who are interested in the preservation of this nation of ours. Indeed, I fear that unless this man is stopped, America will live to regret his emergence on the national scene. The Communists, I believe, we can now handle. Mr. McCarthy, I fear, we may not be able to handle.

MARK J. DALTON, LL.B. '41

Boston

To the Editor of the BULLETIN:

The following verse, signed by A. H. Reed, appeared in the Los Angeles News. You may like to reprint it in the BULLETIN.

McCarthy, sniffing Star—and Larboard  
Detects a "smelly mess" at Harvard  
Something, indeed, may be a-rot there  
But it smelled O.K. until Joe got there.

W. B. WHEELWRIGHT '01

Cambridge

To the Editor of the BULLETIN:

I am enclosing a clipping from the Washington Post editorial page of November 13, 1953. Entitled "Freedom's Legacy," it is a letter to the editor of the Post from Gunther K. Rosinus '49, in which Mr. Rosinus defends Harvard in ringing phrases against the slurs of Senator Joseph McCarthy.

Seldom have I seen a statement which gives such eloquent affirmation of Harvard's tradition of unfettered intellectual inquiry and discussion.

LYNN W. ELEY '49

Arlington, Va.

As one who spent six years at Harvard University, I rather resent the gratuitous advice of the junior Senator from Wisconsin that one should not send one's children to my alma mater because "they might be open to indoctrination by Communist professors." Rather, I hope that my son will make Harvard his choice as well.

An abiding loyalty binds Harvard men to