

seem to suffer some slight indignity in the process. Our personal prestige and pride is a small thing, against the necessity of guarding our free society against those hidden agents of Soviet reaction, who for reasons which vary all the way from lust for power to twisted idealism would sell us into Kremlin slavery. As a government we have an obligation to take every necessary and practicable measure to find and root out treason and sedition in our midst; to see that we have laws adequate for this purpose; that we have security services and procedures which, while remaining under the law, are nevertheless effective to watch and when necessary, disarm those elements who would divide and disturb our country in peace and hand it over to the enemy in war.

Government, however, has another duty; to protect the state system and its servants against policies which in the name of security would destroy its efficiency and its free democratic character; especially to protect individuals against unfounded accusations and vicious insinuations which destroy the individual and weaken the social structure. We have no right to go about confirming the loyalty of our Civil Servants in such a manner that we destroy their self-respect or their efficiency - nor has government the right to take a single step against any citizen which is not warranted by the danger which we face. In attempting to decide how far it can go, in limiting the freedom of the individual in the interest of national security, the government is always faced with this terribly difficult and recurring problem of drawing a line and, once drawn, of not going beyond it.

This problem is difficult for many reasons. The very menace itself may lead to demands on the part of more excitable elements of the community for panic action which goes far beyond the needs of the situation. It also encourages irresponsible and reactionary elements to use the fear of communism as a means of weakening and destroying some of the healthy and democratic restraints which have been placed on their own appetite for power. Every army - however good the cause for which it fights - includes some dubious volunteers. And so it is in the fight against communism. Anyone who rejects the practices and the slogans of these elements is, of course, liable to be called an ally of the enemy - a red. This, in turn, creates dissension, division, suspicion and mistrust; it is playing the enemy's game as surely, and as effectively, as if it were being done by saboteurs or provocateurs. One of the best allies of the communist cause is, in fact, the hysterical diehard. The communists know that and therefore reserve their heaviest fire for the progressive democrat.

In our search for the hidden enemy of our way of life, we must also be careful not to impose regulations or create prejudices which shackle the spirit of enquiry by spreading the impression that anything unorthodox or enterprising or imaginative is suspect. If we reduce the high adventure of investigation to the level of a search in a shallow stagnant pool, we shall soon retreat into the dark recesses of torpid and absolute conformity which is the stuff from which the totalitarian police state is made. This retreat will be certainly assisted if public opinion ties the label of "dangerous" or "red" to everyone who may once have attended a luncheon of the League for Peace and Freedom, or played basketball at High School with the young Radicals. It is easy in a democratic state to become the victim of our fears, just as it is easy - frighteningly easy - to become the victim of our apathy and indifference. If we are to remain free and to move forward we have to avoid both these dangers.