Ira Katznelson

Reflections on the New School's Founding Moments, 1919 and 1933

FROM ITS VERY BEGINNING, THE NEW SCHOOL HAS WRESTLED WITH the consequences of unfreedom, fear, and insecurity, working to advance John Milton's ringing affirmation of 1643: "Give me liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely according to conscience, above all liberties." It has tried to emulate Thomas Huxley's call, when he was installed as rector of Aberdeen University in 1874, that "universities should be places in which thought is free from all fetters, and in which all sources of knowledge and all aids of learning should be accessible to all comers, without distinction of creed or country, riches or poverty."

This singular university has touched many lives through its active values. It certainly has touched mine, offering the special privilege of serving as dean of the Graduate Faculty at a moment of transition, opportunity, and growth. I arrived in the 1983–1984 academic year. The distance of a half century from the founding made it impossible for me to know the earliest members of the faculty, with one exception: the sociologist Hans Speier, the youngest and last surviving founder of the University in Exile, who had been a member of the Graduate Faculty from 1933 to 1942 before serving in the Office of War Information and the State Department's Occupied Areas Division. Professor Speier kindly conveyed a sense of what the first decade had been like. I also benefited from conversations with members of the second and third waves of émigré faculty and students, who shared their histories and expertise

with warmth and generosity. These colleagues included the Austrian jurist and political scientist Erich Hula, who arrived soon after the 1938 Anschluss, and the Stuttgart-born Adolph Lowe, a veteran of the First World War who joined the Graduate Faculty as professor of economics and as the director of a new Institute for World Affairs in 1940, having come from the University of Manchester, where he first had found refuge. I also enjoyed conversations with the Italian New School student Franco Modigliani, who completed his PhD under Jacob Marschak's supervision in 1944 and was awarded the Nobel Prize in Economics in 1985, and with Hans Jonas, who served as Alvin Johnson Professor of Philosophy at the Graduate Faculty from 1955 to 1976 and who first had met Hannah Arendt when they both were graduate students of Edmund Husserl and Martin Heidegger in Marburg in the mid-1920s, before Heidegger reminded the world in 1933 that even the greatest of minds were susceptible to the blandishments of National Socialism.

One of the grand opportunities I experienced as dean was the chance to address the two fiftieth-anniversary celebrations that marked the 1933–1934 founding of the University in Exile. These gatherings were convened by Jonathan Fanton in April and December 1984 at the First Presbyterian Church on Fifth Avenue, and in Berlin's striking Staatsbibliothek, in the large hall named for Otto Braun, the Social Democrat who served as prime minister of Prussia from 1920 to 1932 and who himself emigrated to Switzerland in 1933 when Hitler came to power. The New York gathering awarded the Doctor of Humane Letters degree to Hans Speier and to six exceptional contributors to human rights, including South Africa's Helen Suzman; the Maryknoll Sisters, for their courageous work in Central America; and Poland's Adam Michnik. Erich Hula and Adolph Lowe served as honorary marshals. The Berlin ceremony and commemorative seminar included a memorable talk by Jürgen Habermas on German academic culture and the impact of the absence of a once-vibrant Jewish intellectual and cultural presence, and a moving account of personal and scholarly duress and renewal by Aristide Zolberg, the first holder of the New School's University in Exile Chair, awarded by the city of Berlin.

The commemoration's highlight was an address by Richard von Weizsäcker, who received an honorary degree for his commitment, as the citation said, "to the ideals exemplified by the University in Exile: the freedom of intellectual inquiry, the defense of human rights, and the pursuit of international understanding as an avenue toward peace." His diplomat father, Ernst, had been a member of the Nazi Party, had held honorary rank in the SS, had been a key figure in the 1938 negotiations at Munich, and had served as German ambassador to the Vatican just as Rome's Jews were being deported. In 1947, he was sentenced to seven years for war crimes associated with the deportation of French Jews. So it was particularly moving to hear his son, the new president of the Federal Republic, pay homage to the New School's legacy of courage and resistance. That talk, and Berlin's gift of the University in Exile chair, signaled a salute—sadly, a belated one—"To the Living Spirit," the inscription the Nazis had removed from the great lecture hall at Heidelberg University and which Thomas Mann, who had come to New York in 1937 to celebrate the start of the Graduate Faculty's fifth year, suggested should become the institution's motto "to indicate that the living spirit, driven from Germany, has found a home in this country."

And so it did. This essay recalls and honors that stirring history, as do others in this special issue of *Social Research,* the journal whose founding was announced in the very first public document proclaiming "the establishment of the Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science in the New School [that] has arisen out of the reorganization of German university life under the National Socialist Revolution," in circumstances where "scores of professors of international reputation have been dismissed or given indefinitely prolonged furloughs from their teaching duties." That statement talked of the obligation the New School had seized "to offer temporary or permanent hospitality to scholars who have been deprived of the opportunity of functioning by the political requirements, real or imaginary, of any country," and it spoke of the scale of that task at a time, at the start of the Third Reich, when "the hundreds of able scholars who have been displaced from the German universities represent a priceless resource of all civiliza-

tion." This indeed was a rare act, unique at the time, when the expulsion and repression of scholars from German universities was greeted with indifference by university faculties, boards, and administrators in the United States.

IN HIS MEMOIRS, HANS JONAS DESCRIBED THE GRADUATE FACULTY AS A "tremendously interesting and turbulent institution," an apt reminder that it never has been a dull or tranquil seat of learning, in part because its intellectual ambitions always have outreached its financial means, but not least because, from the start, it hated despotism, distrusted ideological zeal, and promoted the powers of reason.

It has carried three names. In 1933, it was designated the University in Exile. Two years later, it was chartered as the Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science, having become an established American doctoral institution. Today it is proudly and honorably called The New School for Social Research.

Names beckon understanding. Designations matter as signals of identity, as markers of ambition, as projections of activity and reputation. This history of naming and renaming thus invites us to consider the founding of 1933 in tandem with the New School's first beginning. For today's "new" name for what, during most of its existence, was the Graduate Faculty *at* the New School for Social Research, takes us back to that moment in 1919, when the original New School for Social Research was brought into being by luminous progressive intellectuals. Fourteen years before Hitler launched a new Reich by burning books and purging universities, those initiators were distraught at limited wartime freedom in the United States, and deeply concerned about administrative barriers to free inquiry in the academy. From early 1917, they dreamt of and planned for a "new school," a far-reaching alternative to mainstream higher education, a place where a more free, more egalitarian, more tolerant, and more rational society could be imagined and furthered by disciplined critical inquiry.

In this essay I should like to offer a perspective that intersects the familiar narrative that we, the members of the extended family of the

New School, tell about how the opening of the University in Exile in October 1933, in the language of Alvin Johnson, "gave striking evidence of [the New School's] fundamental belief in the great tradition that thought and scholarship must be free." In drawing parallels between 1919 and 1933, Johnson declared that like the original New School, the new Graduate Faculty was "founded on a faith and a judgment: the faith in liberal democracy as the only political system adequate to the needs of an advancing civilization [and] confident that in the end, reason, and its political expression, liberal democracy, will prevail."

Not surprisingly, this narrative of continuity, a story of how, in the words of Claus Dieter-Krohn, "the rescue action the New School undertook in 1933 was fully in keeping with the institution's origins," dominated the fiftieth-anniversary commemorations. All of us can take justifiable pride in the history of how Johnson directed an idiosyncratic center of adult learning to promote its first and highest value of intellectual freedom by fashioning a faculty for scholars who found refuge from an antiliberal and physically threatening totalitarianism. But that magnificent legacy, I believe, gains more intellectual strength and more ethical power not just from a closer investigation of the continuities and elective affinities that connect the two moments of origin, but from an examination that also identifies the internal, indeed inherent, tensions that sometimes proved synergistic and creative, but sometimes did not.

For the familiar history of consistency is too seamless. Separated by a tumultuous decade and a half, the fears, the insecurities, and the orientations to liberty in 1919 and 1933 were not identical. Though joined by many shared commitments, each founding was dedicated to goals and nourished by explicit and tacit understandings that diverged, sometimes sharply, with respect to the standing of democracy and the status of intellectual authority, and with regard to how free scholarship should responsibly conquer fear and advance liberty. Those differences were not superficial. They were grounded in sometimes divergent and sometimes competing understandings about the university's, and liberal democracy's, character, requirements, and prospects.

MEMORY, OF COURSE, CAN PLAY TRICKS, BUT I BELIEVE THE ORIGINAL New School for Social Research became a source of engagement and curiosity for me in the spring of 1966. I was finishing a senior-year undergraduate essay at Columbia University on the race riots of 1919. My supervisor, the historian Richard Hofstadter, urged me to think more broadly about the frictions and fissures that characterized American society just after the conclusion of the First World War. Those divisions included the questions of citizenship and race about which I was writing, but also matters that concerned immigration, ethnicity, and assimilation as well as the scope of legitimate dissent and the nature of academic freedom. The latter was a subject about which Hofstadter had brilliantly written with his colleague Walter Metzger. More than a half-century later, their 1955 book, *The Development of Academic Freedom in America,* remains the best historical work on the subject.

When I studied with Professor Hofstadter during that 1965–1966 academic year, he was finishing *The Progressive Historians*, a beautifully realized intellectual history about the leading figures in the generation of his teachers. The book focused on Frederick Jackson Turner, famous for his thesis about the role of the frontier in shaping American democracy; Vernon Parrington, renowned for his history of American political thought as a conflict between elites and the people; and Charles Beard, America's best-known and best-selling historian, president both of the American Historical Association and the American Political Science Association, and the author, in 1913, of a deeply contentious assessment of the American founding, *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States*. Hofstadter sought to understand how these historians had sought to give analytical and moral meaning to America's past. He explained how the group's "critical, democratic, [and] progressive" impulses had taken "the writing of American history out of the hands of the Brahmins and the satisfied classes, where it had too exclusively rested, and made it responsive to the intellectual needs of new types of Americans who were beginning to constitute a productive, insurgent intelligentsia."

It was in one of my weekly hours with Hofstadter that I learned how it had been Beard, together with yet another progressive histo-

rian at Columbia, James Harvey Robinson—later the New School's first director, before the task passed to Alvin Johnson—who persuaded Herbert Croly, the first editor of the *New Republic,* to convene a planning group for an independent social science institute. The precipitating events were the October 1917 resignation by Beard from his position at Columbia, followed by Robinson in December, after President Nicholas Murray Butler had guided the board of trustees to dismiss Henry Dana, an assistant professor of comparative literature and a socialist, and James McKeen Cattell, a distinguished tenured professor of psychology and a pacifist, for their outspoken opposition to the war in 1917 and 1918, their campaigning against the draft, and their advocacy of conscientious objection. Cattell was a particularly visible scholar. He had served as president of the American Psychological Association in 1895. He founded the *Psychological Review* and owned and edited *Science,* the magazine that became the official publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Coming from the upper reaches of American society, he was an academic pioneer. He did doctoral work at Leipzig and Johns Hopkins; his book *Psychometric Investigation* was the first doctoral dissertation in psychology to be published in the United States; and he became the country's first professor of psychology, in 1888, at the University of Pennsylvania before moving to Columbia in 1891.

The Columbia University firings and the resignations followed on the heels of the founding declaration of principles of the American Association of University Professors in 1915, when John Dewey was elected its first president, affirming that it is "inadmissible that the power of determining when departures from the requirements of the scientific spirit and method have occurred should be vested in bodies not composed of members of the academic profession." The firings and resignations also ensued after President Butler's pronouncement at commencement, after the entry of the United States into the war, that no faculty member would be tolerated who "opposes or counsels opposition to the effective enforcement of the laws of the United States or who acts or speaks or writes treason."

The New School founders persisted in an environment that was not particularly hospitable. Their project was especially audacious because the repression of dissent at Columbia was not exceptional. The wartime quest for security had generated fear, and fear had justified authoritarian violations. In 1917, Congress passed an Espionage Act that mandated sentences of up to 20 years for individuals who encouraged "disloyalty" in wartime. The year 1918 witnessed the passage of an Alien Act that authorized Washington to deport members of anarchist organizations. The same year, a Sedition Act made it illegal to use "disloyal, profane, scurrilous, or abusive language" about the flag, the armed forces, and the country during the war. And 1919, of course, was the very year Attorney-General Alexander Mitchell Palmer initiated widespread raids on some 10,000 suspected radicals, and infamously deported 249 individuals to the Soviet Union on the SS *Buford,* where they did not meet a happy fate.

When the New School opened its doors, in what its announcement called "exigent circumstances," it had two purposes, each bound to the other. Created to oppose outrages against intellectual liberty, the institution sought to promote the study of human affairs in order to renovate democracy. The founders largely shared President Woodrow Wilson's optimism that a new era of democracy and peace might result from how the war—at a terrible cost, to be sure—had defeated militarism, defended liberty, ended archaic empires, liberated nations, and created new prospects for international law based on progressive principles. Having been spared the demographic catastrophes that beset the European combatants and having experienced no devastation on its own soil, the United States, these progressive scholars believed, was ready for, and open to, an intellectual environment where social studies could seek what the first announcement of the New School in 1919 called "an unbiased understanding of the existing order, its genesis, growth and present working" that could advance domestic social reform and help produce what it called "a searching readjustment of the established order of things."

The early New School's assertive modernism and muckraking spirit represented the most attractive pole of American culture, one at

odds with the era's most ugly and violent features, signified by lynching and a resurgent Ku Klux Klan, the closing of the immigration gate, quotas on university admissions, and smug celebrations of speculative wealth. Not surprisingly, the institution was immediately controversial. From the moment it beckoned adult noncredit students to a row of six brownstones on 23rd Street in Chelsea during the second term of Wilson's presidency, it was attacked for advancing radical and subversive ideas.

It was Hofstadter who first showed me how the New School, fashioned as an outlier in the institutional field of American higher education, nonetheless was located at the very core of the country's most important political and intellectual currents. Its first faculty—which included, in addition to Beard and Robinson, the heretical economist Thorstein Veblen, the pioneering student of business cycles Wesley Clair Mitchell, the historian and leader in women's education Emily James Putnam, and the great philosopher of democracy and reform John Dewey—sought, like many fellow progressives, to explain, as Hoftstadter put it, "the American liberal mind to itself." In the period between the founding of 1919 and the second founding in 1933, this estimable group, together with Horace Kallen, the important student of ethnicity and cultural pluralism; Harold Laski, the British Labor Party intellectual; and other innovative scholars, combined progressive history with philosophical pragmatism and critical economics. Soon, under Alvin Johnson's leadership, the content of their modernism extended beyond the social sciences into dance, music, photography, and art, extensions signified by the stunning murals painted by José Clemente Orozco and Thomas Hart Benton and marked by the company of such figures as Martha Graham, Aaron Copeland, Charles Seeger, Peggy Bacon, and Berenice Abbott. Speakers in this first period included Albert Einstein and T. S. Eliot, William Beveridge and John Maynard Keynes, Lewis Mumford and W. E. B. Du Bois, Roscoe Pound and Edwin Seligman, Julien Benda and Fernand Léger, Clarence Darrow and Bertrand Russell.

Though the 1919 founding was first motivated by a defense of the right of this and any other faculty to speak out, the central impulses

behind it were far broader. When Hofstadter wrote about how pragmatism "provided American liberalism with its philosophical nerve," how "progressive historiography gave it memory and myth," and how such powerful intellectual currents "naturalized" American liberalism and democracy "within the whole framework of American historical experience," he could just as well have been writing about this first New School for Social Research as the era's great emblem of ideas and creativity, one marked by a confident, optimistic, future-oriented intellectual program that shared what Hofstadter called a "simple faith . . . in the sufficiency of American liberalism."

THE UNIVERSITY IN EXILE WAS GRAFTED ONTO THE INITIAL NEW SCHOOL in 1933. The arrival of the agricultural economist Karl Brandt; the public finance specialist Gerhard Colm; the economist and assessor of Weimar's Cartel Court Arthur Feiler; the economic theorist Eduard Heimann; the professor of jurisprudence and legal sociology Hermann Kantorowicz; the economist and sociologist and first dean, Emil Lederer; the sociologist Hans Speier; the ethnologist and musicologist E. von Hornbostel; the Czech-born founder of Gestalt psychology, Max Wertheimer; and the specialist in social policy Frieda Wunderlich, as well as colleagues who soon followed before and just after the Second World War, inserted a powerful new set of voices that were far more closely attuned to total war and totalitarianism than their American colleagues and were a good deal more alert to the threats these developments posed less to the quality than to the very persistence of liberal democracy.

This implant created an institution that resembled the two-headed Roman god Janus. After 1933, the German émigré sociologist Reinhard Bendix observed how "two elements [had] converged that had had no prior contact." One institutional face projected "an American . . . reform of higher education through emphasis on adult education, arts and social science." It was grounded not only in progressivism and pragmatism but also in the reform impulses of Protestantism represented by such liberal theologians as Reinhold Niebuhr and Paul Tillich.

Committed to social criticism and improvement within American society, the members of this extended faculty had joined the New School voluntarily while, almost to a person, they maintained "day jobs" at other institutions of higher education. The second institutional face was constituted primarily by a German and Jewish cohort of social scientists with very different biographies and life circumstances. Their lives had ruptured. Their commitment to democracy was marked less by an ameliorative instinct—though they did have strong views about how to make liberal democracy and modern capitalism work better—but above all by resistance to all forms of totalitarianism. They, too, were left of center, but with more of a difference than most of us, and most histories, tend to remember.

Of course, both faces of the New School shared broad commitments to free inquiry. Both were composed of scholars and intellectuals not recruited to more conventional institutions despite their brilliance, who stood just to the side of mainstream American higher education. Yet the group of 1919 and the group of 1933 were highly distinctive, both in fact and in mutual recognition. From the perspective of the newcomers fleeing fascism, the faith of the progressives was too simple, rather credulous, even provincial. From the vantage of the American progressives, in turn, the refugee scholars were too much the global realists, too cynical, too motivated by fear—even, for some, too foreign.

With the creation of the University in Exile, and thus with the return of the social sciences to a status of primacy, the struggle for democracy at the New School was reinvigorated, but in a radically new way. For the battle now was profoundly extended as the newcomers called into question what they perceived to be the innocence of American liberalism as it then existed, even in its most progressive form. With the spectacular collapse of Weimar democracy and a good many liberal regimes in Europe, Asia, and Latin America; with the growth of militant and violent antiliberal Bolshevik, Fascist, and Nazi ideologies; and with misery spread by the failures of financial and industrial capitalism; in short, with the intensification of what President Franklin

Roosevelt so evocatively called "fear itself," the combination of hopefulness and enclosure that had characterized the thought, teaching, and expectations of the New School progressives seemed, as Hofstadter put the point, "too insular and too nostalgic" for "a more complex and terrifying world."

The University in Exile gave expression to this intellectual and political division inside the New School. In the early years, the University in Exile/Graduate Faculty scholars largely took the United States as it was—as a given. They did not treat it as an object of critique. Rather, the issues they took up in their most important faculty institution, which they called the General Seminar, concerned the roots of fascism, the vulnerability and excesses of democracy, the dangerous borderlands dividing freedom from unfreedom, the sources of mass irrationality, the deformations of public opinion. Empirically, they drew overwhelmingly on European, primarily central European and especially German, history and experience. At their best, they compelled attention to what, arguably, were the most vital challenges of their time. They defended the tradition of Enlightenment in an open, rich, and cosmopolitan way, all the while running the risk, as a fellow refugee intellectual, Lewis Coser, put the point, of inhabiting "a kind of protective counterculture that shielded them to a lesser or greater degree from the majority culture that surrounded them." They also were prone to internal scuffles, administrative skirmishes, and, at times, to excessive self-congratulation.

But these limits and pitfalls were trivial as compared to their accomplishments. In many more ways than I can enumerate here, American scholarship was broadened and deepened by the quality, rigor, ethical sensibilities, and deep learning that characterized the great scholars and scholarship at the Graduate Faculty, then and since. I can think of no equivalent-sized unit that ever has accomplished so much. The newcomers also established productive terms of trade with the wider society that included active participation in Second World War government institutions and in postwar policymaking. In becoming American, they broadened what it meant to be American.

Concurrently, though, they risked being thought worse than marginal—as subversive, as individuals seen to be pushing the United States toward yet another global war. Charles Beard, arguably the most important moving force behind the original New School, took just this view. During the 1930s, indeed from 1934 to Pearl Harbor, he was one of the country's most visible and influential isolationist intellectuals, having come to believe that he had been gullible in 1917 when he had supported American participation in the First World War. Hofstadter has noted how Beard thought that "nothing [was] at stake in the impending conflict; and such moral difference as he could find between the contending powers was not enough to warrant American partisanship. He could see only a battle between the ruthless old imperialisms of Britain and France and the new ugly aggression of the fascist powers." Even in the face of the Italian attack on Ethiopia, the Nuremberg Laws and Kristallnacht, and notwithstanding Guernica, the conquest of Poland, and the fall of France, Beard continued to resist American engagement. "The clearer the lineaments of the Nazi state became," Hofstadter continued, "the less Beard seemed to be concerned with what was happening outside the United States." "I think," Beard wrote, "we should concentrate our attention on tilling our own garden."

How different, of course, were the views of the Graduate Faculty. Ever since the publication, in 1915, of Emil Lederer's "On the Sociology of World War," key members of the group that joined the New School in the 1930s were concerned with understanding the implications of their era's new kind of warfare for the character and power of the modern state, the nature of citizenship, the qualities of the modern economy, the features of foreign relations, the mobilizing qualities of ideology, the shifts to mass politics, the dangers for democracy. Lederer's brilliant essay and Hans Speier's innovative 1939 account of "Class Structure and 'Total War'" pioneered analyses of the kind soon made famous in 1941 by Harold Lasswell's essay on the garrison state, a state dominated by specialists in violence. Further, the émigré faculty concerned themselves with a deeper understanding of the antiliberal, antidemocratic thrust of their time, offering as the first book on fascism to come from

the Graduate Faculty Max Ascoli and Arthur Feiler's excellent comparative study of Italy and Germany, *Fascism for Whom?,* published in 1938.

Beard was appalled. In 1939, he "attributed much of the pressure for collective security to 'resident foreigners' who were treating the United States as a boardinghouse." If resistance to entanglement "in the mazes and passions of European conflicts . . . be immorality," he wrote, "the foreigners now boarding here . . . can make the most of it." Beard never regretted his militant isolation. Unrepentant, he wrote in 1948, referring to Roosevelt, "We were secretly governed by our own *Fuehrer*!"

I know, of course, that Beard was not representative of the members of the original New School during the 1930s. Most of its affiliated scholars were deeply affronted by fascist excesses and anti-Semitic barbarism. Most had views rather more like those of Max Lerner, who regularly lectured on 12th Street, who had worked with Alvin Johnson as managing editor of the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, and who coedited *The Nation.* Concerned about fascism, Lerner published *It Is Later Than You Think* in 1938. But its call for what his subtitle identified as *The Need for Militant Democracy* was a plea, written in Popular Front prose, for democratic collectivism, offering the claim that "the central tragedy of our age . . . is not alone in fascism; it lies even more in the liberalism which has thus far proved feckless to cope with social collapse and the fascism that follows it."

It is the "even more" that would have raised the hackles of the Graduate Faculty. The span from Lerner's formulations, which were close in some respects to the émigré economists' interest in planning, to Beard's inward-looking xenophobia, which they would have simply found abhorrent, underscores both the weak and strong differences that distinguished the two foundings of 1919 and 1933. The first saw liberal democracy, and American liberal democracy in particular, as a secure given that could be improved through progressive critique. The Graduate Faculty founders, by contrast, viewed liberal democracy as even more fragile, and the United States as the globe's last best hope. The original New School was born in flight from war and in search of

free speech. The Graduate Faculty was born in flight from illiberalism and, with the end of Weimar fresh in mind, with an anguished concern for the limits of liberal democracy and the fate of free expression.

Throughout the history of the New School, from then to now, aspects of these differences have appeared and reappeared. Indeed, such tensions are endemic and inevitable between a perspective that is more local and one that is more global; between a view that sees repression as the exception and another that knows it can be the rule; between a confidence that knowledge can bring a better day and the experience that knowledge can fuse with evil, even radical evil.

But what is so striking about the history of the New School is that many of its best moments, most inventive scholarship, most powerful teaching, and most effective worldly influence have come when scholars like Horace Kallen, who was a force at the institution both before and after the founding of 1933, and outstanding administrative leaders like Alvin Johnson resourcefully did more than refuse to choose. Such creative figures fused the best impulses of the two foundings, all the while managing to moderate their inherent tensions and productively combine their competing sensibilities. Working with both, they advanced ethically responsible programs that could deepen American democracy, defend a liberal vision of learning and teaching, and engage the largest public issues of their time. Navigating fear and insecurity, they understood that academic freedom is most needed when scholars are at risk and that universities are most vibrant when they encompass diverse commitments in a spirit that is simultaneously combative and forbearing, agonistic and tolerant.

The history we are commemorating thus has broad and significant implications. The range of relations between fear and liberty and the span of ideas about academic freedom that were expressed inside the New School's beginnings of 1919 and 1933 press us to think more intensively about how democracies should confront fear-generating emergencies without losing their soul. More than any other higher education institution in the United States, the New School has had to meet such challenges head-on, for they constitute the very motives

for its existence, and justify its special place in the spectrum of higher education.

For all these reasons, I am delighted to have had this chance to salute the older New School for Social Research, now in its nineti-eth year, and the younger New School for Social Research, which is commemorating its seventy-fifth anniversary. May their noteworthy ambitions, significant achievements, and creative rapport long endure. May their passions and purposes also prod our successors to deepen their commitments to learning and liberty.