

COMMUNICATIONS

To the Editor:

Professor Charles Hyneman, in his memorial to the late Willmoore Kendall in the Winter 1968 issue of *P.S.*, says that Kendall "was out of phase with the liberal mood of American scholarship," and that he was "by no means unaware of the price he paid for performing a service that was not always asked for and perhaps usually not appreciated." Taken in conjunction with the cartoon on page 41 (caption: "Can't we include just one Republican in the department?—as a sort of curiosity, of course."), this comment ably points out a vital part of Kendall's purpose, to advance a belief in theories of government little appreciated by modern "liberals," and to expose some of the illiberalism of these "liberals."

This predominant modern liberalism is, in fact, disguised illiberalism, a sort of modern intellectual fundamentalism which is so secure in its self-righteousness that it refuses even to debate with those who suggest that it might be mistaken.

What "price" Kendall paid for undertaking this task of keeping alive the ideal of free intellectual debate I do not know. It may well have included some subtle form of professional blacklisting in the colleges and universities, or in the professional journals. Whatever the price was, it is curious that a man devoted to the theories of free discussion should be expected to pay such a price to a profession allegedly committed to the values of free debate.

It might be appropriate, therefore, to amend that aphorism of teaching, publish or perish, to include a recognition of that price: publish liberal (as the dominant, self-styled liberal forces in the profession define that term) or perish.

Professor Kendall's commitment to free discussion has not perished with him. Free exchange of ideas may not appeal to modern campus radicals who would deny freedom of expression on "free" campuses to Dean Rusk, George Wallace or representatives of the Dow Chemical Corporation. The idea does appeal to those of us who would rather not be forced to be free. For too long, American colleges were dominated by conservative forces who misused their control much as the conservative members of the Supreme Court misused theirs when society was crying out for reform.

Today, when the pendulum has swung to the opposite side of the political spectrum, self-styled "liberals" perform the same dis-service

to the cause of free discussion and objective pursuit of truth by treating their opposition to the ignominy of disdainful neglect. Students, exposed to a nearly unopposed barrage of modern "liberalism" in the classroom, are the unfortunate pawns in this game of intellectual vengeance, this "liberal" vendetta against the weakened remnants of a once formidable foe. Such students are not being taught; they are being indoctrinated. And this indoctrination is no more acceptable than the vicious pressures towards conformity of thought indulged in by state legislatures with their loyalty oaths, or Congressional Committees with their never-ending investigations of subversives.

The free debate of opposing ideals is essential for the maintenance of ideals of a truly free university. Commitment to social action and reform may, and ought, to, proceed from the free flow of opposing views unencumbered by subtle social pressures which make a mockery of freedom of belief. When a profession, or a university, becomes the efficient instrument for the furtherance of a particular political philosophy, shunting aside all hostile or reasoned opposition as irrelevant, then it ceases to warrant any claim to the label of liberal.

Professor Kendall has now perhaps paid the ultimate price anyone could expect him to pay. But the academic world is lesser for his absence. What price he may have paid for his unpopular beliefs in this life I do not know. That this price, in payment for holding to beliefs unacceptable to the dominant "liberals" in the academic world, should ever have been paid at all, should cause anyone committed to freedom of thought a moment's pause. No punishment, no price, however silent, however private, however indirect, subtle and beyond merely legal redress, is adequate excuse for the abandonment of a truly liberal philosophy. A re-reading of, and re-commitment to, J. S. Mill's essay *On Liberty* seems very much in order for the "liberals" of the academic community who may have forced Kendall to pay a price for his beliefs.

Roland E. Dufault
Rutgers-The State University

To the Editor:

As a member of the Council of the A.P.S.A., I submitted to its September 1967 meeting a resolution which would have put the Association on record as criticising what the Ameri-

can Civil Liberties Union had called "one of the most serious breaches of the freedom of the university in recent decades." The resolution was not considered on its merits because in the view of our legal adviser and other members of the Council (many of whom expressed support of the substance of the proposed resolution) it was debarred by the Constitution which provides that the Association may take positions only on matters "immediately concerned with its direct purpose" defined as "to encourage the study of political science. . . ."

Thereafter, at the 1967 Convention, I talked with several officers, members of the Council, and many others who indicated that they would willingly support an amendment to the Constitution to permit the Association to act in cases involving serious breaches of or threats to the freedom of the university or the profession. Accordingly, I propose the following amendment, for which the requisite number of supporting signatures has been obtained, (as an addendum to Article II (2.) of the Constitution):

The Association shall not be debarred, however, from adopting resolutions or taking such other action as it deems appropriate in support of academic freedom and of freedom of expression by and within the Association, the political science profession, and the uni-

versity, when in its judgment such freedom has been clearly and seriously violated or is clearly and seriously threatened.

I believe it to be the distinct and, in some ways, the distinctive obligation of a society devoted to the study of political science to help safeguard the freedom of the university and the profession; an obligation which derives in no small part from the fact that ours is a particularly sensitive and vulnerable discipline, the study of which cannot truly proceed, in any meaningful sense, unless the channels of investigation and discussion are open and free.

That is not to say or to propose that the A.P.S.A. should in any and all circumstances express its opposition to abridgments of such freedom. My amendment would limit intervention to cases when such freedom is "clearly and seriously" affected. (I, for one, would wish the A.P.S.A. to take a position *only* in such exceptional cases.) If it is argued that this language is merely hortatory, I respond that it is a standard to which all may repair and that I trust the judgment of the Council (which may make recommendations) and of the Association to apply this limitation with wisdom and discretion. The alternative, that is, to deny to the Association the constitutional freedom to protest for itself, the profession, and the university against gross violations of academic freedom, seems to me unthinkable.

Samuel Hendel
City College,
City University of New York