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Every once in a while an event occurs which does not seem in itself to be of great magnitude, but which is a portent of something vastly significant. In 1820, when the admission of Missouri as a state raised the slavery issue, Thomas Jefferson wrote: "Like a fire bell in the night, [it] awakened and filled me with terror." Of the same event, a representative from Georgia said, "You have kindled a fire that all the waters of the ocean cannot put out, which seas of blood can only extinguish." Ten years afterward all the pollsters would have said that Jefferson's alarm and Cobb's prophecy looked ridiculous, but eventually both were amply vindicated. Great crises seldom mature rapidly; those who read aright the signs of the times may well take thought when they perceive "a cloud small as a man's hand."

Teachers' strikes should be regarded as "a fire bell in the night." From a quantitative point of view they have not been important. Relative to the huge number of students in our schools and the

1 Address given at the monthly meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York on November 4, 1948 in New York City; reprinted through the courtesy of Dr. Wriston and of the Chamber from the November, 1948 issue of its Bulletin.

On this occasion Dr. Wriston was requested "to discuss charges of Communism in our schools and colleges." In introducing Dr. Wriston, Mr. Frederick E. Hasler, the Chairman, said:

"American business men are becoming increasingly concerned with the spread of radical thinking in our educational institutions. They read in the presses of activities of so-called student Communist groups, of teachers being accused of Communist affiliation or of having Communist leanings. They wonder just how much or how little of the educational dollar is being used to teach our youth faith in and loyalty to American ideals and traditions.

"No one is better qualified to answer these questions than the distinguished gentleman who is our guest of honor and speaker today, the head of one of our great educational institutions. He is a gifted author, an orator, and a militant champion of the ideals and enterprises which have made America great . . . ." —THE EDITORS
huge American educational program, the teaching days lost, if your memories of school days have not faded, have been insignificant and the knowledge lost unnoticeable.

The teachers' economic situation urgently called for redress; public authorities were laggard in recognizing the issue, dilatory and halfhearted in attempts to meet it. A crisis in salaries was the occasion for the strikes, but it by no means supplies a complete explanation. For nothing is more firmly established historically than that the teacher is poorly paid. One has only to come from a family where teaching has been part of its tradition to be acutely aware of how poorly paid teachers have always been. If there is any labor of love which involves contributed services to a high degree, teaching shares the distinction with preaching. That single fact is all the evidence necessary to prove that teachers' salaries were only the occasion and not the cause of the strikes.

There is no possibility of accounting for the strikes without taking into consideration the drift of many intellectuals away from a profound conviction as to the rightness and the validity of the existing social, economic, and political situation, or at least the situation as existed day before yesterday. I mention teachers' strikes first because they are dramatic and easily observed and not subject to argument as to their reality.

So far as universities and colleges are concerned, there is criticism of the "Red" doctrines supposedly preached in the classroom. State legislatures launch investigations. Men lash at the symptoms but fail to make adequate diagnosis. Neither "Red" nor "un-American" is a precise term. Each is an omnibus catchword employed to indicate any disharmony between the teacher and his social-economic-political environment. I agree entirely with what General Eisenhower said last night, that the colleges have very few Communists or even Communist sympathizers on their faculties. But it would be folly to deny that there are many teachers who are intensely critical of our present social and economic structures—both of which seem to some of them to be stratifying dangerously. I am not going to minimize the evidence of the discontent on the part of many intellectuals with the present state of American society and economics.
My purpose today is neither to praise nor to condemn; I am essaying an analysis, seeking to make clear what caused the emotional tensions now all too obvious. At the end I hope to present some intimations as to how so dangerous a trend may be reversed.

Perhaps the best place to begin is to point out that many or most of the arguments with regard to the American economic system have no direct application to teachers in schools, colleges, and universities. The profit motive, often described as the mainspring of business, and properly so described, is not and should never become the dominant element in their lives. For example, America has many Nobel Prize winners in the sciences; it would be a shallow and ignorant man who gauged their worth by their income. What is true of them applies also to thousands upon thousands who quietly do their work in schools, colleges, and universities. Without their labors neither our society nor our economic system can survive; yet they function to a large extent outside that system of economics.

That may be one reason why industrialists sometimes find it hard to understand professors. It accounts for the scornful comment so often heard: “If professors had enough ability and the competitive spirit they would not be teaching.” Nothing could be further from the truth. Those who do not know the academic world at first hand seldom have any idea how competitive it is. Nor can they appreciate its hazards. Free enterprise is looked upon by business men as the epitome of risk-taking, but the research worker, concerned with advancing the frontiers of knowledge, takes, as President Conant has well said, “a tremendous gamble. Only those who have spent many years in this type of work can ever understand how great is the risk and what the emotional consequences of that risk are.” Often a man invests several years of his life before he knows or can know whether his research is a success or a failure. I am intimately acquainted with that risk.

Indeed, I can speak of it at first hand because after I had spent five years on a piece of research, I asked three experts in the field, all at one university, what they thought of it, and they said there
was nothing to do in the field. The same men gave me a prize for it five years later, but I had to invest those ten years of my life before it could be subjected to the critical judgment of my peers as to whether it was a success or failure.

The professor is a risk-taker, but unlike businessmen, he does not profit financially when he succeeds. A professor of physics or psychology often has to pay for the publication of his most original papers; learned books bring no financial rewards. He receives no patent income from the fundamental discoveries which industry is free to exploit for profit.

Being, in this sense, outside the economic order the intellectual does not share its gains directly. Nevertheless, he suffers from its weaknesses. In the great depression teachers’ salaries were cut; in many instances reductions were drastic. Very few colleges or universities escaped cuts; some were very serious indeed. Now that inflation is here teachers are not receiving increases comparable to those of workers in industry.

Professors can say with a great deal of objective truth that they share the losses but do not share the gains. When there is hardship they do not escape it; when there is prosperity they still do not escape hardship. If that is true—and I have never heard it disputed—(and this is the keyword of the sentence) they have less firsthand reason for enthusiastic defense of all aspects of our social-economic structure. They are in a position to consider it from a detached point of view; their observations and conclusions are not biased by self-interest.

Moreover, the nature of their work creates an obligation to be critical. They must re-examine all premises as they look for new truths and fresh insights. Angry objectors to intellectual radicalism assert that professors ought to have an over-riding loyalty. I agree heartily. But their deepest loyalty is like that of the poet—it is to an ideal. As Goethe felt that “above all nations is humanity,” so, for the true intellectual, above all other loyalties is loyalty to truth.

The public recognizes this to some degree. For example, no one asks whether the scientist is “radical” or “conservative” when he deals with the atom. He must be willing to follow wherever thought and experiment may lead. The history of concepts of
the atom during the last fifty years reveals revolutions in thought of the first magnitude. That is what we expect; we ask only whether the scientist is making new discoveries and expanding the boundaries of truth.

Now this obligation applies equally to those who study society, economics, and politics. We must expect—and not fear—new ideas in these fields. In the best sense of the word professors must be radical, ready to deviate from ancient belief when fresh insights, novel analyses, or additional data so dictate. Scholars have two reasons for objectivity therefore. They are not part of the main stream of economic life, and the nature of their profession requires them to hold in check emotional commitments which might divert thought.

From both these angles of vision they can see that economics and politics are so closely intertwined as to be inseparable. Economic forces are never left without political guidance; every economy is to some extent a "managed" economy. There is no such thing and has never been such a thing as "laissez faire."

The intervention of the government in the economic system to control (or attempt to control) its swing in one direction or another is the rule, not the exception. I found I was sitting beside a portrait of Alexander Hamilton here. Before speaking to you, I read through his famous report of 1791, to be certain that I would not in any way misrepresent what he said. If we were to use modern terms in describing his critically important argument, it would be called an essay in favor of "planned economy." Alexander Hamilton specifically rejected letting nature take its course; more particularly he denied "that industry, if left to itself, will naturally find its way to the most useful and profitable employment." Indeed, he asserted without reservation "that the interference and aid of . . . governments are indispensable." He proposed the use of public funds as capital through the public debt.

Hamilton's reasoning was based upon the necessity for proper balance between agriculture, manufacture, and commerce in building a great nation. Without reservation he accepted government responsibility to attain that end. He believed it to be the interest of countries to diversify the activities of their citizens. He elaborated the arguments for protection. "Protection," need I say,
is a governmental shield from the operation of economic laws. It is designed to affect prices, profits, and products—all by managing economic processes. Political action to control economic forces has not been advanced solely by radicals and this is a good time to emphasize that. Hamilton is the final answer to any such notion.

Both Democrats and Republicans have long promised—and are still promising—to interfere with economic laws when they hurt; they have both promised—and still promise—to mitigate the harshness of nature's processes in the economic sphere.

It would be possible to give endless illustrations of efforts to control our economy, either directly or indirectly. The academician, familiar with this history, knows we are not dealing with absolutes, but with relatives—not "shall government intervene?" but "how much shall it exert its influence?" He is not so much shocked, therefore, by proposals to manage the economy a little more as is the businessman who has never thought much about the past record.

III

There is another reason why teachers are critical. They observe and analyze the deviations from orthodoxy upon the part of the priesthood of American capitalism. "Faith without works is dead." Often defenders of the faith in "free enterprise" do not show forth in their actions the ardent profession of their lips.

More particularly, the historian observes that it is not government alone which has prevented the normal functioning of the price system; individuals and corporations have gone even further than government. Many years ago it became necessary for government to restrain private manipulators of the price system. It was a rock-ribbed Ohio Republican conservative, John Sherman, who gave his name to the Anti-Trust Act—the cornerstone of many subsequent policies. I am not holding him responsible for the present fogs of uncertainties, but no one today would pretend that there were not vast economic abuses which made that or some other law essential.

And what were those abuses? They were efforts upon the part of small groups to deflect the operations of economic laws for their
own profit. Trusts, cartels, trade agreements, rebates, and hundreds of other practices that will come to your own minds, constituted a confession of lack of faith in the beneficence of economic normalcy and an attempt to distort the natural functioning of economic laws. That manipulations have been frequent and formidable is transparent to any objective observer.

The academic critic may be pardoned when he is skeptical that all such practices have now been eliminated and that those who profess complete faith in free competition and the "automatic" operation of economic laws will henceforth show by their acts that they fully believe their own words.

Moreover, business and government are not always on opposite sides, not even when the Democrats are in power. The most notable recent instance was the NRA. It was not designed by theorists, but by practical politicians and hard-headed businessmen so little aware of the fundamental presuppositions of free enterprise that they were ready to abandon their birthright for a mess of pottage. Seeking to meet a desperate situation they threw economic orthodoxy and free enterprise to the winds. Looking back upon the codes and what they sought to do, no candid observer could reach a different conclusion. Even though it may be forgotten by the businessmen who participated with such zest, the record of their economic heterodoxy is there for him who runs to read.

It is well known that I do not advocate a "planned economy"; quite the contrary, I have fought against it in every way possible. On grounds ethical, philosophical, and psychological; for reasons social, economic, and political; to the end that we may have a free society with a dynamic economy, I am for the enterprise system, with as little control as will assure order and establish justice.

Before we denounce those who do advocate such programs we must recognize that the economy has never operated freely, "automatically," without controls. That being so we are never offered a sharp, clear alternative: "Shall we have controls, or shall we have no controls?" It is always "how much control?"—a relative, not an absolute, matter.

I have mentioned two broad reasons why intellectuals may easily become critical of our social-economic structure. First: they
suffer from its failures; they do not profit commensurately from its successes. Second: scientific objectivity requires them to observe the reality that, when the chips are down, many who argue most ardently against a planned economy support it to a greater or less degree; by their acts they deny their affirmations—or modify them more then they realize.

There is a third reason why intellectuals may be drawn into support of a managed economy. Probably the most massive single economic fact in America today is the public debt. Not long ago able expositors proved to their own satisfaction that there could not be a debt of any such size and that if contracted it could not be managed. Today that once incredible debt is a fact; moreover the management of it is inescapably a public act.

I think the management of that debt and the policies ancillary and incidental to its management have been markedly inflationary. But no one—and when I say "no one" I think I am speaking by the book—has any belief that the debt can be left wholly to the operation of economic forces. When the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board speaks of having an "instrument of monetary management," and the Chairman of J. P. Morgan and Company, discussing the duties of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board, says, "This is no time for rough management of our economy," the fair implications of such phrases need no elaboration.

It is clear that government action will have marked effects. That would suggest to observers whose profits from prosperity are slender and whose losses from adversity are severe that the government should protect the interests of the so-called "middle class" whose status has been deteriorating alarmingly. They have every reason to know that thus far they are the forgotten men in the management of the debt.

There is a fourth reason for the discontent of many intellectuals, which is not economic but social. There was a time when the significance of their function was fully recognized. The famous Northwest Ordinance of 1787 stated that "religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." Even earlier, in 1764, the Brown University Charter stated it explicitly: "Whereas institutions for liberal education
are highly beneficial to society... they have therefore justly merited and received the attention and encouragement of every wise and well-regulated state.” Last night Mr. Winthrop W. Aldrich read from Washington’s Farewell Address words to the same effect.

Those phrases embodied a deep public conviction. For a century and a half to be a professor in an institution of learning was to hold a position of great distinction. One evidence of this was the eagerness of many others to be called “professor”—even phrenologists and magicians. Today, on the contrary, even on the campus, men eschew the title. While it is preserved within academic circles, professors do not like to carry the label outside.

An incidental illustration of the low esteem in which the intellectual is held was the characteristic caricature of the New Deal, if you can remember back that far in the face of today—it was always a tatterdemalion academic in ragged cap and gown. No future historian will be deceived into thinking that the New Deal was a product of professors. It was fabricated by worldly-wise and vote-wise politicians who changed not only their direction but even their basic theories when it seemed politically profitable. The switch from rigid economy to spending as a way to prosperity epitomizes their readiness to reverse the field. Of course many discontented intellectuals put rational façades upon the operative policies of those who really shaped developments. Yet it was the academics who were pilloried for “crack-pot theories.”

Lack of respect for the intellectual is reflected in salary payments. When both salaries and public recognition are inadequate, the normal effect is to alienate those who are so treated.

IV

The decline in the social status of the intellectual has occurred at the most irrational as well as the most inopportune time. More than ever before technology and production are utterly dependent upon the theorist. Few studies were ever more “abstract,” few more “remote from daily life” than the pioneer work in modern physics. Studies on the disintegration of atoms during the thirties were sensational in a limited circle—but unknown or a joke
to the "real" world. No one thinks them funny now. It was the "pure," "useless" research spreading from university to university around the world which supplied the foundation for the use of atomic energy. If, as is so often asserted, we live in an atomic age, that age was born in the universities.

Similarly, if the government debt is the most conspicuous single datum in our economic life, it is also a fact that it is going to be managed by university-trained economists—good or bad, orthodox or heterodox. They will certainly exercise an influence far beyond that of economists in any other time in history.

As fundamental science must precede applied science, as the theorist precedes the practitioner in industry and in government, so also, much more subtly, but just as really, the assumptions which underlie many of our everyday thoughts and actions spring from the intellectual group. The Kinsey Report has been a best-seller for reasons which I do not understand; it would never have been published but for the work of Freud. Many an advertising man who knows little about behaviorist psychology is governed, nevertheless, in his techniques by what the behaviorists taught. People who would resent being regarded as Marxist in any way nonetheless employ many of his ideas. Indeed a good deal of business practice is predicated upon Marxian economic determinism, though free enterprisers would shudder at the source, if they were aware of it.

John Maynard Keynes was a professor with novel ideas about the economic system. Those ideas when popularized and seized by the politicians have in many ways affected the economic policies of states. Long before he was heard of in business circles he had a keen perception of the power of ideas, for he wrote: "The ideas of economists and political philosophers, both when they are right and when they are wrong, are more powerful than is commonly understood. Indeed the world is ruled by little else." Many an opponent of Keynesian economics vouches for that truth. One of those opponents wrote on one occasion: "In the short run, it is true, ideas are unimportant and ineffective, but in the long run they rule the world." The ideas of the man in the street are often the diluted, popularized thoughts of intellectuals.

This can be illustrated again and again throughout history.
The French Encyclopedists who turned on the government in the eighteenth century were criticizing the abuses of absolute monarchy; their warnings were too long unheeded and a cataclysmic revolt followed. Similarly, the Russian monarchy many years later lost even the tolerance of the intellectuals and it was destroyed in the catastrophe of revolution. In our own time there was a strong intellectual element—which I can summarize with Bernard Shaw, with Harold Laski, Beatrice and Sidney Webb, and other names which occur to you—in the leadership of the Labor Party in Britain which dedicated itself to the fundamental alteration in the nation's social, economic, and political structure. Intellectuals are often highly sensitized to the dangers that inhere in a social system; their warnings may be storm signals which we continue to ignore at our peril.

Even when an idea is wrong, it may have great influence. It is one of the Marxian dogmas that capitalism means war. That theory runs counter to two dominant realities in American life that you and I can see—no other great power was ever so pacifist as the United States and until recently businessmen were predominantly isolationist, in large sections of the nation they still are. Thus the Marxist ideology is refuted by easily perceptible facts. Yet that does not prevent large segments of the world from accepting the error as gospel; indeed the continued repetition of the erroneous belief is bringing us to the very brink of a world cataclysm at this very moment.

Right or wrong, the intellectuals will have tremendous influence. When decisive responsibilities lie in the hands of any group it is not wise to treat them with grave social disrespect. Yet that is precisely what produced teachers' strikes. Though teachers influence our children, society remained callous to the teachers' adverse economic position until startled by drastic and dramatic action. Public apathy arising from unconscious contempt provoked a forceful reaction. The use of power is inappropriate to the intellectual; he should count on reason and persuasion to attain his ends and I am not condoning the teachers' strikes. But force, however inappropriate, is always the ultimate recourse when everything else fails.

If one looks at the matter with wide open eyes—devoid of pre-
conception and prejudice—it is clear that the striking teachers were treating society as society had treated them. Because society mistreated them their respect for the political structure declined. The restraints which should have prevented people with such social responsibilities from making war upon society were loosened. On the basis of power, they sought—and gained—things which had been denied them on the basis of values. As in every war, there were faults on both sides—but the basic fault was the gross neglect by the American public which drove the teachers to substitute pressure tactics for reason.

V

College and university professors have not yet gone so far. They still exhibit the individualism of the thinker. As President Conant has well said, “Of all the activities of man today the one which must remain most starkly individual is research.” Ideas are born in individual minds; they never become communal property until their originality has been lost. Until the scholar finds himself in a hopeless situation, he is loath to organize defensively. He prefers to associate with other scholars only for mutual enrichment from the free exchange of thought, for the satisfaction that comes from the interplay of lively and fertile minds.

But there are clear indications that trouble can develop here as in 18th Century France, 19th Century Russia, and 20th Century Britain. It is promoted when business men scoff at the theorist, saying: “It may be good in theory, but it is no good in practice.” I don’t know how many times I have had that thrown at me. Nothing is ever right in theory if it is not true and real, but stupidity and archaism in industrial practice often fail to exploit experimental and theoretical advances.

Many a basic discovery has lain gathering dust on the shelf for want of imagination to see its possibility. Incidentally, there is a touch of irony in the often-heard demand that professors should leave their ivory towers, abandon theories, and do something practical for the benefit of society.

Do you know where that idea comes from? That is a Communist idea. They have a word for it. They call it social utility.
They want no research without social utility. They denounce pure, free research where a man follows curiosity wherever it leads, and leaves it to time and technology to find utility in the new truths he discovers. It is odd indeed to find free enterprisers adopting Marxist views of research. It is another instance of insufficient awareness of the fundamental presuppositions of our own system. If you want free enterprise in business, you must accept free enterprise not as a necessary evil, but as an essential virtue in the intellectual world.

The theorist, the technologist, and the production man are in an indissoluble partnership; each has his place; but the initiation of the productive cycle is with the professor. It is folly to sell his work short. The self-styled "practical" man is often the one in error; the least alert are frequently the most critical of the theorist. Such obscurantism and current anti-intellectualism hold down faculty salaries and prevent adequate research funds from being available. And I speak from firsthand experience because I once worked with a great industry and the only problem that was really hard for me to solve was to get executives to realize that the more fundamental the research, the larger dividends it would pay in the long run. Something must be done to join the professor's overriding loyalty to the truth with his natural love of his country and its social-political-economic institutions. The suggestion that we should "crack down" on critics, fire the dissenters, or make them so uncomfortable that they remain silent is the worst possible program. Academic freedom is all the professors have left—and however widely their political, social, and economic views may vary, they will unite in defense of that last bulwark of their profession.

The academic is willing to accept a relatively low economic ceiling. I wonder if you know what that is. I don't suppose there are more than fifty professors in America getting as much as $20,000, and the average salary of professors in America is under $5000. I say, they are willing to accept a low economic ceiling if they have compensatory satisfaction in terms of social response, if they hold positions of responsibility and dignity and honor which their importance justifies. *Among* the necessities is an increase in salary—and the need is substantial and urgent. Something had
better be done soon before stark necessity forces the professors to follow the teachers into pressure tactics and substitute power for reason.

VI

There is one final element in this analysis which calls for comment. That is a changing balance, or one might properly call it a growing imbalance, between publicly supported and privately supported education. You don't see that very much in New York, but I have just been in the Middle West in a state where there is no competition against the publicly supported institutions. There was a time not very long ago when all higher education and most of what we know as secondary education were in private hands. Under the egalitarian principles of American democracy as the pressure toward the ideal of educating all American youth increased, it was inevitable that there should be increasing public support.

Consequently there grew up systems of public and of private education—partly competitive and partly complementary. Each has made its own great contribution. There is no reason for hostility or tension between them; the public interest requires both. But it also requires that there should be a reasonable balance between them. Monopoly, public or private, is as bad for education as for anything else.

That essential balance is not being maintained. Across the country the number of teachers employed by the public and paid from the public treasury is now vastly larger than those employed by "private" institutions. At the lower school levels the disparity is overwhelming; at the secondary level it is great and at the university level it is great and accelerating. Moreover, salaries in private institutions are falling rapidly behind those in public institutions.

This is a fact of profound relevance to our topic. If a professor derives a living wage from private sources and if his social status is reasonably comfortable, he accommodates himself to the system which gives him those satisfactions. That is why through most of our history you haven't had any complaint about radical pro-
But if a man's income is derived from the public treasury, he is in no position to object to public management. Moreover, if his salary from the public is larger than that received by professors in endowed institutions, he is going to compare private enterprise unfavorably with public management, for he is better off depending upon the public treasury and would suffer from the fluctuations of private enterprise.

If the time ever comes when all the professors in the colleges and universities of the country draw their salaries from state or federal governments, they may become critical of their working conditions, unionize and strike as the teachers have done. But they are not likely to be opponents of the expansion of governmental activities. Not being dependent on private enterprise, they will have less and less concern for the fate of the enterprise system.

Now I must shock you, for I must emphasize the fact that it is not alone the professor in publicly supported institutions who is now dependent upon public funds for his salary. Most of the larger private institutions are drawing very large parts of their budgets, indeed predominant shares of the costs of research in the sciences, from contracts with the federal government. In some institutions this figure has risen as high as 50 per cent or more. I saw a statement from one of the leading endowed institutions the other day, and 55 per cent of all of its revenue, including tuition, endowment and everything else, came from government contracts. In such circumstances many professors even in endowed institutions no longer look to endowment (that is to private enterprise) to supply the tools of their trade and meet the costs of their experiments, or even a substantial part of their salaries. They have become dependent upon federal funds.

And there is something just a little amusing in the fact that many of us are sitting near the front door with our guns cocked to keep Uncle Sam from coming in, when he came in through the kitchen door long since and is now fully established in the back part of the house and doing business at the old stand. This means, therefore, while the argument about federal support of education rages, the real subsidy has already begun and so great is the leverage of these government contracts that many privately endowed
institutions would find their programs almost crippled if those federal government contracts were withdrawn.

Professors whose livelihood and labor are not supported by private enterprise, who look to federal funds for both, are not going to resist federal “encroachment,” either there or elsewhere.

Count Sforza, now again Foreign Secretary in Italy, commented bitterly during the long years of his exile upon the intellectuals who watched freedom destroyed. All those whom he denounced drew their stipends from the state; it had become their only possible source of revenue and they became subservient to the state. And I say to you in all seriousness that those who have an interest in the preservation of the enterprise system will be well advised to see to it that the private institutions are not weakened further and that government does not engulf or even dominate higher education.

This analysis was not designed as a popular approach; it is a serious effort to call attention to something of profound importance to American life. All the evidence indicates that a larger proportion of young people are to be in school for longer periods of time than ever before in the history of the world. That being so, the temper, the attitudes, and the doctrines of teachers are of vast significance. If, as I have indicated, there has been a growing breach between those who teach and our social and economic system, then it had best be understood.

The cure is not to denounce or to harry the faculties; it is to reform the situation which makes the intellectual bear the burdens without sharing the rewards. It is to recognize his strategic, indeed his vital, place in our economy, our society, and our public life and to proceed rationally and with as much light and as little heat as possible to redress the balance, and give to the teacher that which he must have.