

Sidney Hook

COMMUNISTS IN THE CLASSROOM

Professor Hook sets the record straight.

One of the strangest aspects of American public opinion as reflected in media and television attitudes and judgments is the periodic revaluation of the movement that began in the early forties, and culminated in the period after the Korean War. This movement attempted to free American educational institutions—especially colleges and universities—from the services of teachers who were *present* and *active* members of the Communist party. Currently, because many of the graduates of the New Left in the sixties have graduated to positions of influence in newspapers, television, and universities, a largely mythical picture of what occurred, and why it occurred, is being sedulously cultivated. According to this myth, there were hardly any members of the Communist party teaching in the educational establishment anywhere; and those who were teaching actually engaged in no unprofessional activities. Actions taken against them constituted a blind, irrational purge of scapegoats, a witchhunt comparable to the worst features of repression in American history.

The comparison of any effort to uphold the educational integrity of the teaching process to a witchhunt is doubly instructive and confusing. It implied that since there were no witches, there really were no Communists. And since those who persecuted the witches were ignorant bigots and cruel creatures devoid of compassion and pity, so those who approved of barring *present* and *active* members of the Communist party from school systems were vicious and mindless reactionaries.

Sidney Hook, professor emeritus of philosophy at New York University, is a senior research fellow at the Hoover Institution. This article is abbreviated from a chapter of his recently completed memoirs, Out of Step: Some Pages of An Unquiet Life, which will be published next spring.

One of the many palpable difficulties in such a position is that the existence of Communist party teachers, and indeed in some institutions, of cells of such teachers, was easy to demonstrate. At this point the retort usually comes—what of it? The Communist party was a legal party like the Democratic, Republican, and Socialist parties. To which the crucial answer is that with respect to the canons of professional ethics, the Communist party was decidedly *not* like the Democratic, Republican, and Socialist parties. The latter did not issue instructions to members to behave in ways that were utterly incompatible with the ethics of teaching and inquiry. For example, the official organ of the Communist party, the *Communist*, May 1937, instructs members of the Communist party who are teachers, among other things, to proceed as follows:

Party and YCL [Young Communist League] fractions set up within classes and departments must supplement and combat by means of discussions, brochures, etc. bourgeois omissions and distortions in the regular curriculum . . . *Marxist-Leninist analysis must be injected into every class. . . Communist teachers must take advantage of their positions, without exposing themselves, to give their students to the best of their ability working-class [i.e., Communist] education.*

Only when teachers have really mastered Marxist-Leninism will they be able skillfully to inject it into their teaching *at the least risk of exposure* and at the same time conduct struggles around the school in a truly Bolshevik manner [italics supplied].

It apparently is hard for some individuals to understand that the cardinal charge of unprofessional conduct against members of the Communist party was not their Communist ideas or faith, not even their membership in a Communist party (for *some* Communist parties, like the Socialist Workers party, did *not* instruct their teacher members to act in this way), but the specific directives to violate the fundamental rules of professional ethics.

Another palpable difficulty in the current view that the movement to initiate a witchhunt among teachers was led by the contemporary embodiments of Cotton Mather was the character, views, and lifelong attachment to liberal causes of some of the most eloquent spokesmen who defended the policy to bar *current* and *active* members of the Communist party on the grounds of academic freedom. Among them were Norman Thomas, Elmer Davis, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. (for elementary and secondary schools), and John B. Oakes, the editor of the editorial page of the *New York Times*. There were very many others. Unfortunately, it is also true that the same position was taken by some notorious illiberals and obscurantists on grounds that were irrelevant and impertinent to the issues of professional ethics. To this very day, those who defend the rights of members of the Communist party to teach usually ad-

dress themselves to the invalid and untenable arguments of the illiberals but ignore almost completely the position of Norman Thomas and others like him.

The third, and for present purposes, sufficient piece of evidence that the legend of a Communist witchhunt is a myth, is the fact that the pedagogical credo of The New School for Social Research, whose graduate faculty was largely made up of scholars purged by totalitarian regimes, expressed the rationale of a principled position with respect to those who were under instructions to violate the canons of scholarship. Its programmatic declaration, first adopted by the Graduate Faculty, and then by the general faculty, spelled out the liberal premises from which it reached conclusions bearing on the key issue:

The New School knows that no man can teach well, nor should he be permitted to



teach at all, unless he is prepared "to follow the truth of scholarship wherever it may lead." No inquiry is ever made as to whether a lecturer's private views are conservative, liberal or radical; orthodox or agnostic; views of the aristocrat or commoner. Jealously safeguarding this precious principle, the New School strictly affirms that a member of any political party or group which asserts the right to dictate in matters of science or scientific opinion is not free to teach the truth and thereby is disqualified as a teacher.

Only ignorance or a stubborn refusal to face the facts can deny that the Communist party in the U.S. dictated what positions its members were to take on any issue in any field in which the Communist party or the Kremlin, i.e., the Russian Communist party, which controlled its leadership, had taken an official position. A close study of the public positions (and changes in those positions) taken by individual teachers publicly identified with the Communist party from the early thirties to the death of Stalin, shows not a single instance of criticism of a Communist party position that was not met with some kind of disciplinary action, usually expulsion.

The issue of how individuals committed to uphold academic freedom should be treated by their peers if they are engaged in practices designed to destroy academic freedom is part of a much larger problem. This larger problem is how a democratic community, pledged to uphold the Bill of Rights, should treat those citizens who invoke the protection of the Bill of Rights to agitate for a dictatorship that would destroy the Bill of Rights for all except those who would support such a dictatorship. Although the problems are related, they are not identical. With respect to the larger problem, the principled democratic or open society tolerates even those who are opposed

to such a society, who even agitate against it, provided that they do not conduct *activities* outside the rules of the game, i.e., do not engage in conspiratorial activities, organize underground groups, sometimes even paramilitary groups, or engage in other actions that constitute a *clear and present danger* to the safety of the democratic republic. The failure of the democratic Weimar Republic of Germany to realize

It apparently is hard for some individuals to understand that the cardinal charge of unprofessional conduct against members of the Communist party was not their Communist ideas or faith, but the specific directives to violate the fundamental rules of professional ethics.

that tolerance does not extend to those who are *actively* intolerant contributed to its downfall.

Of course, the kind of activities that members of the Communist party cells engaged in on campuses were not conspiratorial in the sense described above. They were unprofessional, like the *anonymous* publication of literature denouncing by name their colleagues, of whose politics they disapproved, as plagiarists, thieves, embezzlers, police spies and informers, anti-Semites, or guilty of other scurrilous and libelous charges. Copies of these publications were put in the hands of teachers and students. In addition, members of the Communist party often recruited for the Y.C.L. among their students, sought to increase the number of politically like-minded persons in their departments, and carried on incessant campaigns of defamation against any critics of the Communist party, taking pains to conceal what they were doing.

It does not require much imagination to put oneself in the place of someone who has been victimized by these systematic campaigns of defamation and character assassination.

The specific problem of what to do with teachers who violate professional ethics and seek to destroy academic freedom is primarily a moral one. During the period we are discussing, members of the Communist party were

they were members. This was because at the time only one person had identified them as members, and it required two witnesses to convict them of perjury. When two witnesses became available, the tactic changed and members of the Communist party were instructed to refuse to answer questions about their membership on grounds of possible self-incrimination. Later on, several individuals contended that they had invoked the Fifth Amendment not to conceal their own membership but only to protect others whom they would have had to name had they not invoked the Fifth Amendment. This in effect was tantamount to admitting that the Fifth Amendment was being illegitimately invoked, since it does not give the individual the right to refuse answering questions that would incriminate others. A systematic campaign has succeeded in confusing a large section of the public. Some members of the Communist party have claimed and been given credit for great heroism in refusing to answer questions about their membership in the Communist party *only* because they wished to protect others. Lillian Hellman, for example. But there was absolutely nothing heroic in invoking the Fifth Amendment on her part or on the part of anyone else. She could have answered the question truthfully about herself and then refused to answer questions about others.

The autobiographical relevance of this essay is to state the actual position I took on the issue of present and active members of the Communist party in our schools. My position has consistently been misstated, defamed, and denounced, not only by Communists but by unscholarly and unscrupulous persons courting popularity for their great liberalism during the troubled years when the presence of Communist party teachers in colleges was a public issue—years in which they said nothing at all or ran with the hares and hunted with the hounds. Thus Alfred Kazin as late as 1981 charged that I urged that "presumed [sic!] Communists" be dismissed from the school system.¹

The truth about my position is simple to find and has been developed at length in my *Heresy, Yes, Conspiracy, No* and other publications in which I have defended the right of teachers and scholars to hold any views on the basis of their inquiries, *including* Communism and Fascism. I have always opposed federal or state investigations of teachers and teaching in our academic institutions, including loyalty oaths. I opposed the Fineberg Law of the state of New York which made vague and potentially misleading criteria of mere

pledged to bring about a state of society and education in which academic freedom would not exist. Those were the days when, in every Communist nation, teachers whose thought and intellectual expression were of a dissenting character were not only being dismissed but jailed, herded into concentration camps, and sometimes executed.

What was the punishment some of the members of the Communist party actually endured in the few cases where their membership was deemed to unfit them to pursue honest inquiry and teaching? They were not imprisoned or deprived of their freedom. They were not precipitously fired without due process, deprived of their housing, and barred from any other productive activity. In fact, most members of the Communist party who were dismissed from their posts soon earned as much or more money as lay psychologists, analysts, literary and technical advisors. That some individuals, who were not members of the Communist party, were dismissed for refusing to answer questions about whether they were members or not, is probably true. But this raises a different kind of problem, and I am concerned for the moment only with those about whose membership there is no doubt. Concerning them, it seems to me indisputable that they had no moral right to continue in their posts in any institution where evidence existed that organized Communist activities were going on.

Some of the legal issues are complex but they do not go to the heart of the matter. During the Rapp-Coudert Committee's investigation of the New York City College system, members of the Communist party were instructed by Party lawyers to deny outright that



political association relevant in determining academic fitness. I have consistently argued that the faculties themselves must uphold the standards of professional ethics, and only under the rules of due process move against those who violate them. I have refused to appear before any Congressional Committees investigating Communists from the outset and vigorously criticized the exaggerated and irresponsible claims and behavior of Senator Joseph McCarthy.

Even though I believed that membership in the Communist party rendered an individual unfit, because of his violation of professional ethics, to be a member of the teaching staff, I did *not* believe that the mere fact of membership should result in automatic dismissal. Faculty Committees on Professional Ethics should not undertake any investigations except in the face of evidence of Communist party cell activities, such as anonymous publications of the cell, flyers and other forms of activity for which the Communist party took responsibility that had an adverse bearing on the freedom to teach or learn. Once identified, a member of the Communist party should be confronted with the evidence of Communist activity, including the instructions referred to above, and given an opportunity to repudiate them or to convince the Faculty Committee that his research and teaching did not conform to Communist party directives. The burden of proof would rest with him.

Although during the last fifty years I have maintained that the enforcement of the academic ethic must rest with the faculties themselves, I have been saddened to observe a reluctance upon the part of faculties to correct abuses of the academic ethic, and to take any disciplinary measures against individuals who have clearly violated the responsibilities of honest teaching that are correlative with its rights. There seems to be a complete indifference to the behavior of teachers who use their classes as a bully pulpit for the propa-

¹When challenged to justify this absurd attribution, Mr. Kazin referred to an article published in the *Saturday Review* of April 18, 1953. The article "Can We Trust Our Teachers?" which I answered emphatically in the affirmative, contains no such expression or anything resembling it. The truth of the matter, which throws some light on Mr. Kazin's scholarship and intellectual responsibility, is that he picked the phrase up from an article by Morris Dickstein, published in *Partisan Review* in 1974. Mr. Dickstein, attacking cold war liberals like myself during the fifties for, among other crimes, impugning the innocence of Alger Hiss and the Rosenbergs, charges me with urging that "presumed Communists" be dismissed from schools. No other writer, even out-and-out Stalinists, has ever taxed me with holding such an absurd position.

gation of political and other ideas that have no relation to the subject matter of their course, or whose one-sided, extremely partisan commitments to controversial issues is reflected in biased reading lists and unscholarly assignments.

It would hardly be an exaggeration to say that once a teacher has acquired permanent tenure, "anything goes" in the classroom. Sometimes blatant violations of the academic ethic have provoked a public outcry that has led to ill-considered demands for legislative intervention or to proposals to set up extra-academic bodies to monitor what is being taught in the classroom, and to report alleged distortions of the truth to some presumably objective

The Fifth Amendment does not give the individual the right to refuse answering questions that would incriminate others.

body that knows the truth. If implemented this last suggestion would be a crasser violation of academic freedom than the abuses it would remedy. It would make easier the unscholarly activity of those who are now draped in the mantle of defenders of academic freedom to continue to subordinate the genuine teaching process to "the cause" of the moment.

What, then, can be done to restore the university to practicing allegiance to the ideals of the academic ethic traditionally associated with the mission of the university to the pursuit of objective truth? Granted that in the past it always fell short of these ideals, and that since human beings are weak and fallible it always will do so to some degree. But surely there is a profound difference between the consequences of trying to live up to these ideals and the consequences of indifference and repudiation of them. And although it may surprise some to learn of it, there are those who assert that the concept of objective truth is vacuous, and that what passes for the quest for truth is merely a disguise for the quest of power.

It seems that the best hope for a change in the climate of university opinion is for the senior scholars with recognized intellectual authority to agitate for the observance of the highest standards of scholarship in bestowing the grant of permanent tenure on candidates. By and large the failure to live up to the academic ethic is observable among those whose primary allegiance is not to the subject matter they teach but to something extrinsic to it.

But to return to the record. On November 10, 1982, I received a letter from Irving Howe congratulating me on my 80th birthday, acknowledging that despite his disagreements, "I've learned from you," and expressing pleasure at having been my "near contemporary and almost-friend." Shortly before or after, he published his autobiography, *Margin of Hope*, which I read later out of natural curiosity to discover what my "almost-friend" had learned from me. To my astonishment, I found that it was not only replete with bare-faced inventions about his past, like the claim that he and his group had given "critical support of the war [against Hitler and Fascism] though we didn't make this explicit,"² but was full

of serious misstatements, distortions, and outright inventions about my views! This is not the first time I have received kindly personal letters from individuals who have publicly denounced me.

Howe carries on at length about my intolerant attitude toward present and active members of the Communist party, implying that I advocated their automatic and categorical exclusion, and suppressing any mention of the fact I opposed any such policy. Worse still, he charges that I saw "merit" in the Smith Act whose use by the Roosevelt administration against Howe's fellow Trotskyists I attacked. Recognizing the unlikelihood and un wisdom of its repeal, I urged its explicit

²See Arnold Beichman's review essay, "A Refined Irving Howe," *The American Spectator*, February 1983.

amendment to bring it in line with "the clear and present danger" criterion of Justices Holmes and Brandeis that would prevent its potential abuses. I am also criticized for not being sufficiently critical of Senator McCarthy despite my call, when McCarthy was riding high, for the organization of a national movement to retire him from national life.

The book contains unmeasured expressions of contempt for Social Democrats, especially right-wing Social Democrats, whose views Howe ends up embracing in a watered-down form. I found particularly offensive his running glorification of that remarkable man, Norman Thomas, "for whose life's work one felt so grateful." In an aside, he deplores the lapse of this great man who became one of the leaders of the American Committee for Cultural Freedom. What he is silent about is that during his entire political career as a Trotskyist, which lasted many years, Howe's Trotskyists made Norman Thomas their favorite target for ridicule and denunciation. Howe's effort to identify himself now with Thomas is a political obscenity.

There are some kindly references to me and my wife in Howe's book which it would be churlish of me not to acknowledge—if they were true. But he must have dreamed them up or confused us with other kind souls. He has my wife pursuing him with chicken soup at Stanford when he was teaching there, out of concern for his health, and my genuine and persistent solicitation as to whether he "was eating enough," which led him to forgive me for calling him "Oiving"—presumably the way a native from Brooklyn pronounces his name. The dates of my stay at the Center for the Advanced Study of the Behavioral Sciences and his spell of teaching at Stanford do not match. I have a dim memory of having met him once during a flying trip in the



early sixties to give a lecture at Stanford. But his memory of my alleged avuncular friendliness to him could not be accurate because of my fierce and long held resentment of an incident he does not report in his book.

The incident refers to an episode in 1948 at the 10th International Congress of Philosophy. I found myself practically isolated and alone, unable to persuade the delegates at the executive session of the Congress to endorse a resolution I introduced in behalf of freedom of philosophical inquiry in all the national affiliates of the Congress, present and future. This was rejected as an anti-Communist provocation on my part by most of the participants, fearful (the Berlin blockade was on) that the Red army might be rolling over Western Europe. To my surprise and delight, the most impassioned supporter of my resolution was Father J. M. Bochenski, a Dominican priest and logician, the most distinguished of a small group of Catholic clerics present.

I reported this in my account of the Congress in *Partisan Review*. Whereupon Irving Howe, hiding behind his party pseudonym, attacked me in the official Trotskyist organ for selling out to the Catholic Church and predicted that I would soon become a member, thereby confirming a prophecy he had heard Max Shachtman make. I suppose I should have been amused. But those were the days when I was perhaps the most vitriolic critic of the Catholic Church in America, for whom the American public schools were public enemy number one, and John Dewey public enemy number two. My fury with Howe was so strong that in perspective it seems excessive. But it was there. It was exacerbated by the anonymity of his charge. I notified the

editors of *Commentary* and *Partisan Review* that I could no longer contribute to them if Howe appeared in their pages. They must have communicated that to him because I soon got a letter from Howe protesting my effort to deprive him of a living. We exchanged some heated letters, in one of which he admitted that he had been unnecessarily nasty. But my resentment lingered for a long time. That is why

I have written voluminously enough to be hanged by my paragraphs. But rarely am I quoted fairly and at length—so that the reader can see the full rope of my infamy.

I am morally certain that it was not I who was so lovingly concerned over whether "Oiving" was eating enough at Stanford!

There is a certain irony in the situation, however, for Howe has been able to persuade some other recent young historians that his version of the forties and fifties, despite his selective reordering of events, is the true one, that *he* was the true embodiment of intellectual independence, and that cold warriors like me had become merely poet laureates of American imperialism. Of course our views have changed about many things in the struggle to defend the free world, but Howe's views have limped after ours in the same general direction. All of us today are more or less partisans of the welfare state but only Howe (and Michael Harrington, too) is free of any sense of disquiet, not to say guilt, in adhering to views that would have spelled the end of the free society of the West.

I shall mention only two instances of the success of Howe's misconstructions of the past on the new cultural historians. The first is Alexander Bloom's *Prodigal Sons* published in April of this year,¹ late enough for him to have read and ignored Howe's *Margin of Hope* in which Howe lies about his position with respect to the war against Hitler. Bloom's book is marked by three major features aside

ism, for the repressions of the status quo, and believed that "a new war is necessary or inevitable"? Why, Sidney Hook, Norman Thomas, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and the other leading members of the American Committee for Cultural Freedom!

Poor benighted Mr. Bloom. He is apparently unaware that among other things, members of the ACCF believed that a war with the Soviet Union was neither necessary *nor* inevitable, that we were always quoting Churchill's contention that World War II was an unnecessary war brought on by a failure to understand the nature of Hitlerism and the consequences of appeasement, and that we were strong adherents of George Kennan's and Harry Truman's policy of containment.

Howe has scored an even more significant triumph in winning to his point of view a book that was published a year earlier than Bloom's. This was Richard H. Pell's *The Liberal Mind in a Conservative Age: American Intellectuals in the 1940s and 1950s*. If Bloom's book in the light of the evidence must be considered naive and politically ignorant, Pell's book can only be characterized as vicious. According to him, "McCarthyism found its chief inspiration in the ideology of the cold war—an ideology that was constructed . . . by liberal politicians and anti-Stalinist intellectuals who were responding to what *they* regarded as a genuine threat from the Soviet Union" (my italics). That threat according to Pell was non-existent. In other words, Harry Truman and his administration and Sidney Hook and his various committees created the cold war which McCarthy, whom both Truman and Hook hypocritically denounced, exploited for his demagogical purposes. The behavior of the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe, in Czechoslovakia, in Berlin, had nothing to do with it. The revelations of Gouzenko about the Kremlin's penetration of the U.S. and Canadian regimes had nothing to do with it, nor the conviction of Hiss, the Rosenbergs, Judith Coplon, Remington, and almost a score of others, not to mention Chambers's exposure of the members of his ring—only one of many—all of which preceded McCarthy's election to the Senate with the help of the Communist party (which was intent upon defeating McCarthy's rival, the anti-Communist Bob La Follette). All of this presumably had nothing to do with the cold war! Compared with this egregious lack of objective scholarship, Pell's false and misleading attribution of quotations in some of his references to me is relatively unimportant. I dare say that even Irving Howe will find Mr. Pell's embrace somewhat embarrassing. □

from a legion of minor errors, like his assumption that the pre-World War I slum environment in which I grew up was essentially similar to that of the others he wrote about, most of whom were of a later generation. The first feature is a failure to offer any analysis about the major issues about which we polemicized. He refers to them, describes the contestants, but refrains from assessing the meaning and consequences of their position on the issue at stake. He is like a military historian enumerating the generals on both sides of a famous battle but who doesn't tell us what the battle is about. All we know is that General Howe is his favorite general. Second, whereas the many protagonists in the book are often quoted at length, my views are characterized only with snippets of reference, at most a sentence or two. Curiously enough, I find this to be true in most critical references to my reprehensible views. I have written voluminously enough to be hanged by my paragraphs. But rarely am I quoted fairly and at length—so that the reader can see the full rope of my infamy. The third feature of Mr. Bloom's book is that he is openly and fearlessly on the side of Howe and *Dissent*, the quarterly edited by Howe. (Of course, Bloom never made that clear in the one or two interviews I gave him, and telephone calls of inquiry he made in which he was so ingratiatingly flattering that I should have been suspicious.)

Bloom, of course, has every right to his prejudices. But what was it that appealed to him about *Dissent*, which was founded in 1954, long after most of our battles were over? The opening editorial of *Dissent* expresses it: it was against conformism, against apologists for the status quo, and against "the assumption that a new war is necessary or inevitable." And who was for conform-

¹*Prodigal Sons: The New York Intellectuals and Their World*. Oxford University Press, \$24.95.



THE PUBLIC POLICY



KEMP-BRADLEY-PACKWOOD

by Gregory A. Fossedal

There's a dirty secret about the popular tax reform shaped by Senate Finance Chairman Bob Packwood of Oregon. The bill, now breezing through the Senate, was actually produced by John Mueller—a top aide to Congressman Jack Kemp of New York.

Not that Mueller actually sat down and drafted the present bill word by word. In fact, as the press has noted incessantly in recent weeks, it was Packwood, with some stimulus from Democrat Bill Bradley of New Jersey, who drew up the scheme that is winning raves from both Democrats and Republicans.

Bradley and Packwood deserve major credit for devising and releasing a bold alternative after tax reform degenerated into a hopeless mess in the Senate. Yet, as the accompanying chart shows, the now-popular approach taken by Packwood already existed—in a bill drawn up by Mueller for Kemp back in 1984. To the extent reform is now back on track, it's because Packwood and Bradley drew up a bill closely resembling Kemp's original plan. The result is a Kemp-Bradley-Packwood tax reform that Senate Majority Leader Robert Dole says may reach the President's desk by Labor Day.

So how is it that Kemp's name seems to go virtually unmentioned in major press accounts of the tax reform turnaround? The *Wall Street Journal* recently ran a huge feature outlining Bradley's impact on tax reform. The piece reduced Kemp to a mere footnote.

In part, such stories reflect the intellectual stubbornness of places like the *Journal's* Washington bureau that for years regarded tax cuts with scorn. The *Journal* news section was writing as recently as a few months ago that tax reform was dead, floundering due to a lack of voter interest.

Gregory A. Fossedal is a media fellow at the Hoover Institution and a contributing editor of *Harper's*.

It's also true, though, that Kemp has done little, at least in recent months, to lobby for his own ideas in Congress. "Jack would just polarize things if he got too involved," says a longtime adviser. "It would make it hard for people like Bush, Dole, and all the Democrats to save face."

Thus Kemp, wisely or no, has kept a deliberately low profile. "We've got Ralph Nader, the *New Republic*, and the *New York Times* editorial page running around promoting the end of the progressive tax system," says Jeff Bell, another member of the Kemp brain-trust who first introduced Bradley to tax-cut economics in their 1978 Senate race. "Jack is smart to let them have the limelight."

Of course, there's more to the story than Kemp's generosity. Kemp made some unfortunate decisions in 1985 that made his commitment to tax reform appear doubtful. He supported the first Treasury bill's retention of various oil and gas loopholes; these can be debated on economic merits, but politically, giving in to the oil lobby was bad symbolism. Kemp also came out in flat opposition to the second Treasury bill—rather than taking Bradley's wiser stance that the proposal needed fixing but was a step in the right direction.

Kemp never seemed to make up his mind what price, in terms of closed loopholes and higher taxes on business, he was willing to pay to buy lower personal tax rates. In this he mirrored the ambivalence of many conservatives. *Human Events*, *National Review*, and the *Wall Street Journal* editorial page didn't decide until late in the game whether they trusted tax reform or not. "Jack was never very enthusiastic about reform," says one close associate. "He had a tough time figuring out whether to stick with it when the Chamber of Commerce crowd came out against the whole approach."

Even in recent months, it's been organs like the *New Republic* and the

New York Times business section that have been most interested and informed about tax reform. And if Kemp deserves credit for conceptual foresight, so do people like Joseph Pechman at the Brookings Institution—who were talking about reform twenty years ago. "Bill Bradley did it on his own," Bell said. "He came at this from a liberal angle, briefed himself, and put together a proposal." It just so happens that on tax reform, the ideas of people like Bradley and Kemp now intersect. "Bradley's gotten more notice in the press," says Joni Sarles, an aide to Packwood. "He had the most impact. But it's true our bill is very similar to Kemp-Kasten. Heck, Kemp-Kasten is very similar to Bradley-Gephardt."

In fact, pro-reform lobbyists say perhaps the major obstacle left will be to change the Kemp-Bradley-Packwood

bill sufficiently, in a coming House-Senate conference, so that Ways and Means Committee Chairman Dan Rostenkowski, the Illinois Democrat who shaped the House reform bill, can pretend he made some contribution to the process. Rosty's bill, like the early Packwood proposals, closely resembled the Bradley bill of 1983 and the Treasury Department's plan of 1985, leaving many loopholes intact and keeping tax rates up at 30 to 35 percent and more.

Once Bradley and Packwood shifted back to the Kemp approach—to their credit—the results were predictable. Lower rates excited tax-cutting Reaganites, while shutting off more loopholes revived the interest of fairness-minded Democrats.

So let's have cheers for the three members of Congress most responsible for the coming passage of tax reform. One of them, though, is Jack Kemp. □

The Evolution of Tax Reform: Tax Plans Compared

	Kemp	Bradley	Packwood	Packwood most resembles . . .
Top rate	28%	30%	27%	Kemp
Index tax brackets vs. inflation	yes	no	yes	Kemp
Index tax on capital gains	yes	no	no	Bradley
Home mortgage fully deductible	yes	no	yes	Kemp
Poor tax: income at which family of 4 starts paying income tax	\$14,400	\$11,600	\$13,500	Kemp
Poor tax: estimated tax liability for family of 4 at \$14,000	none	\$300	none	Kemp
State and local income tax deductible	no	yes	yes	Bradley