The Idea Of A Multiversity

Jim Lucier, who holds his Doctoral degree from the University of Michigan, is a former college professor now become the Associate Editor of the highly regarded Richmond News Leader. Dr. Lucier is a recent winner of the coveted Freedom Award, from the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge, for his brilliant editorial work on the Richmond News Leader.

Early last December, the public became aware that something was wrong at Berkeley. The students were going wild, the administration was acting in a manner both arbitrary and irresponsible, and the faculty was dizzy. Or so it seemed. And so it was.

The University of California is the largest of the state university systems in America. Its campus at Berkeley is the most prestigious of state universities. The marquess of its great laboratories are lit up with the biggest names in the professor business. For anyone who wants to crack the higher education racket in its nutshell, Berkeley is the place to go. Of course one doesn't go there to get an education.

What's wrong with Berkeley is briefly described in a word. The word is "multiversity," the barbarous term of Berkeley's President, Clark Kerr.* "Multiversity" signifies the disorientation of learning, the fragmentation of the intellectual world, and the Byzantine sterility of such an institution. When facts are taught without a unifying philosophy, there can be no "university." And when men are taught to despise the moral tradition, the result must be anarchy. A riot is at least, after all, a sign of inner disorder.

All this is not to single out Berkeley for censure. When we talk about Berkeley, we are talking about American universities generally. We are talking about temples devoted to the abstract pursuit of error, and an academic doctrine of freedom from the hard demands of reality. The problem is that our academic "Liberals" are basically anti-intellectual; they don't have the brains to defend themselves from themselves. Berkeley, as the biggest and the best, and with the additional handicap of state support, simply is further advanced in disintegration. Berkeley selected itself.

The Facts

The facts of the recent and notorious Berkeley student revolt are quickly disposed of. They are unimportant. What is important is that the disturbances were the calculated results of prolonged and purposeful planning and agitation. The pretext of the revolt was as irrelevant as the drugging of a Buddhist monk so that he might commit public suicide, or the shooting of some Panamanians as evidence of U.S. imperialism. So too, the "free speech movement" began without any curbs on freedom of speech.

The battleground was a narrow strip of university-owned land, a sidewalk really, just outside the main gate of the

* Kerr, who recently announced his intention to resign, has changed his mind.
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Berkeley campus. The university very sensibly had a ban on political activity on campus; you could do anything you wanted off-campus, providing it was within the law. The cachet of the student politicos was to pretend that the strip of campus outside the ornamental gate was “off-campus.” It was a workable arrangement, but last fall the administration inexplicably rescinded the squatters’ rights. It was a typically blind and stupid action of administrative bureaucracy, and the reaction of the students was also typically blind and stupid. It was the sort of thing that is usually forgotten in a week.

But “Liberals” being what they are, and certain students continuing to object loudly, the administration this time set out to “negotiate”—a position totally contradicting any claim to authority. Certain students immediately saw the edifice crumbling. They illegally set up tables in the forbidden zone on September thirtieth, and were reprimanded. (The technique of creating phony martyrs is repeated endlessly all over the world.) Four hundred students showed that they already had sheepskins, and followed their leaders into the fold; in this case, the university’s administration building, Sproul Hall. It was a sit-in, and they sat all night.

The next day a CORE activist, an ex-student, was arrested for defiantly setting up a booth in the forbidden place. Noontime crowds, with subtle urging, streamed to his rescue. The police car with the police and their prisoner was seized by the mob, while an agitator delivered his harangue from the car roof. A policeman was bitten in the leg by one of the more hydrophobic intellectuals, who at last had a subject he could get his teeth into. Thus the Free Speech Movement was born. By nightfall ten thousand students had gathered, and five thousand policemen. Berkeley’s bill for the riot was fifteen thousand dollars.

The student leaders were merely suspended, a certain mark of weakness. They should have been expelled. But of course, in the “Liberal” world, all positions are relative; there is no right and wrong. The administration began to negotiate, as a prelude to accommodation. On October twenty-ninth, a faculty committee censured Chancellor Edward Strong for not reinstating the suspended students until “hearings” could be held. Negotiations with the student committee continued—a committee which, in the best “Liberal” fashion, included some of the suspended students. On November twentieth, the university agreed to rescind the political ban, but determined to discipline the ring leaders.

Then the fabled Mario Savio, he of the sharp teeth and cannibalistic disposition, grew restive. This wasn’t just a case of student discipline; it was a case of Constitutional rights, wasn’t it? Right there in the First Amendment, it says, “And the right to harangue the mob from the roof of a stolen police car shall not be abridged in any way.” Accordingly, Savio and his friends once more started “civil disobedience.” Illegal tables. Picketing. Demonstrations. The grand climax came with the massive sit-in on December second. Working with assembly-line methods, the police quite literally had to drag 814 persons out of Sproul Hall to jail. Less than three-quarters of the law breakers were registered students. Yet the sum of $85,000 mysteriously appeared as bail so that everybody could go home.

Less than a week later, President Kerr capitulated abjectly. There would be no ban on demonstrations. There would be no discipline. The suspended students would be reinstated. Dr. Kerr spoke to thirteen thousand students in the amphitheatre. But as the meeting ended, Savio rushed on stage from the wings, rudely brushing past the President. He strode to the microphone to take over the meeting without so much as a request.
to speak. Policemen were forced to haul him kicking and screaming from the stage. It was thus, with such an affront to free speech, that the Free Speech Movement turned down President Kerr’s amnesty. The next day the Academic Senate, representing the faculty, backed the student rebels 825-115, demanded a complete hands-off policy on political activity, and insisted that future discipline cases come before the Senate instead of the administration. And that put the administration in its place.

All that remained was for the Regents to put the final stamp of approval on the policy that no discipline would be meted out when students were arrested for illegal off-campus activity. The only semblance of a shred of authority left was largely symbolic, in the person of Chancellor Strong. The Regents took care of that on January second when they kicked poor old Strong downstairs. His name, no doubt, was his downfall; it sounded too authoritarian. The new Chancellor, Martin Meyerson, fit the new mood of nebulous and sketchy authority; he is Dean of the College of Environmental Design. But, alas, as we go to press it appears that the environment is a little too much for Meyerson. Some students were carrying around signs bearing four-letter words, and Meyerson stated, in the announcement saying he might resign, that “The four-letter-word signs had a significance beyond their shock impact.” He was tooting the Kerr theme: “Love me or I’ll leave.”

Who’s On First?

Obviously, the Berkeley affair was no ordinary campus hassle. Pantry raids and dormitory rebellions spring up over night, and are exhausted as quickly. The Berkeley affair was prolonged, organized, and carefully executed. The final results were entirely out of proportion to the precipitating cause. And those results were the achievement of a very important objective of Communist agitation. From now on, no Communist student may be disciplined for indulging in illegal agitation. And indeed, all students are freed from the discipline of the community. This way lies anarchy, in a specious argument from the First Amendment.

For the achievement of such important objectives, you need several layers of influence. You need, first of all, a general atmosphere of tolerance for self-destructive and suicidal attacks on the existing organization of society. Then you need a large body of men who passively accept such a philosophy, and will teach it to others. Then you need students who will accept the revolutionary philosophy uncritically, but would never have the self-assertiveness to act upon it. Then of course, you need the activists. Of these there are two kinds. The first kind abandons every virtue of justice, prudence, patience, and temperance in favor of an onrushing humanitarianism. The humanitarian knows no discipline, and is to be censured rather than pitied. The other kind of activist knows all about discipline. He is under discipline, and does as he is told. Naturally, there are few people who have reached this state of degradation.

Thus it becomes possible for a handful of organized agitators to immobilize a whole university (or any other target) and make it do its bidding. Scoffers point to the small number of Communists and Leftists involved, and look for other causes. But it is precisely the small number of visible Communists that makes the operation so efficient. The leverage factor, when the ideal conditions are present, is enormous. “Liberalism” and the academic mind are the most ideal conditions imaginable.

A survey taken among the arrested sit-inners bears this out. We must remember to begin with that the faculty voted overwhelmingly to support the
students. And why not, if rebellion had been exactly what they were teaching? The vote of the Academic Senate was a vote of confidence in themselves. Of the 27,000 students at Berkeley, less than 800 bleated on schedule as the wool was pulled over their eyes. The survey indicates that fifty-seven percent of them belonged to no political organization at all; it is a shocking indication of the effectiveness of mob psychology. One quarter of those arrested belonged to "Civil-Rights" organizations like CORE and SNCC, and we may assume that they had already been conditioned to respond to the violent overthrow of whatever they didn't like at the moment. Only 4.5 percent belonged to "radical" political organizations.

The effectiveness of this 4.5 percent has been misunderstood by many who noted in the Press accounts that the Free Speech Movement (FSM) included such stalwart conservatives as the Young Republicans, the Intercollegiate Society of Individualists, and assorted YAFer types. But these groups were just drawn in for window-dressing. For agitation, to be really effective, requires a plausible excuse. If possible, it is best to avoid a cause celebre that appears to be the work of only a small faction. The conservatives got taken in because they too were political groups who set up tables outside the gate.

The leadership of the Free Speech Movement quickly passed to the radicals because they were constantly escalating the argument with illegal actions. The conservatives vainly pleaded with the weak administration to enforce the no-politicicking ban until it was removed by official action. Warren L. Coats Jr., President of the University of California Young Republicans, has stated publicly that the conservatives did not participate in the illegal protests, and in fact withdrew before the melee of December second.

For the same reason, one must not be surprised to find no evidence that the enthusiastic leader of the FSM, Mario Savio, is or had been a Communist. "Liberals" become resentful when their folk heroes unexpectedly turn out to be Communists, because Communists are so difficult to explain to ordinary, unenlightened Americans. No, when there is an idealistic hot-head around, he makes for a better image in the newspaper interviews. And of course, Mr. Savio had been carefully prepared for such a role, whether he knew it or not.

As a bona fide "Liberal" philosopher, Savio was greatly taken by SNCC, and was its representative on campus. Last spring, he was arrested in San Francisco during an illegal "sleep-in" demonstration at the Sheraton-Plaza Hotel. Locked up in the bullpen, he fell in with one Jack Weinberg, another Berkeley student and a CORE leader. During the summer, Savio hardened his convictions on the front lines in McComb, Mississippi, and then returned to school. Now whether or not the Sheraton-Plaza demonstration was organized by a Communist Front, it shall shortly be the privilege of the reader to judge; massive Communist participation in the Mississippi invasion is a matter of record. The Communists encourage such projects because they build sympathy, and provide training in defiance.

And sure enough, come October first, Jack Weinberg was the defiant one arrested outside the Berkeley gate; and his pal Mario Savio leapt to the roof of the police car in which Weinberg was detained. In the same moment he leapt to the leadership of the Free Speech Movement. No elaborate hypothesis is needed to explain this action; he simply bore witness to the camaraderie of outlawry—further enticed, no doubt, by his remarkable taste for the leg of the law.

Then what were the radical political organizations in the Free Speech Move-
ment? Well, there were the notorious SNCC and CORE. There, too, were the W.E.B. DuBois Club, the Women for Peace, Slate, and various assorted Socialists. The common denominator of most of these students was that they had participated in the San Francisco Sleep-in under the name of the Ad Hoc Committee to End Discrimination. More recently they had been picketing former Senate Majority Leader William F. Knowland's Oakland Tribune in an effort to force the newspaper to change its editorial policy—a strange beginning to the Free Speech Movement some might think.

University of California President Kerr issued a statement charging that the FSM had been infiltrated by Peking-oriented Communists—that is, the Bad Communists as distinguished from the Good Communists of Moscow. And indeed the Peking influence was on hand. But a remarkable number of the principals in the Free Speech Movement were sons and daughters of the good old high-style Moscow types. The rebellion was sparked by second-generation radicals:

- **Bettina Aptheker**, a history major, and twenty-year-old daughter of Herbert Aptheker, top theoretician of the Communist Party, U.S.A. Miss Aptheker has been active in the W.E.B. DuBois Club, Slate, and the Ad Hoc Committee. She was arrested in the San Francisco sleep-in. Her father has a doctorate from Columbia University, and edits the Communist Party organ, *Masses and Mainstream*. Her mother operates a New York City travel bureau which specializes in tours of the Soviet Union. Miss Aptheker was appointed, with Savio, to the faculty-student mediating committee to help settle the free speech dispute. Later she accompanied Savio and two others on a tour of Eastern colleges.

- **Margaret Lima**, close friend of Bettina Aptheker, is the daughter of the CPUSA Chairman for Northern California, Albert J. “Mickey” Lima. Miss Lima has been active in the same organizations as her friend. The Communist Party boss, himself, was photographed at a campus free speech rally October fifth. Miss Aptheker, incidentally, lived for a time in the Lima household.

- **Jacqueline Barbara Goldberg and Arthur Goldberg** are both students and are brother and sister. Miss Goldberg was University of California delegate to Moscow from Women for Peace. She also participated in the activities of the American Russian Institute, a San Francisco Communist Front. Mr. Goldberg was a member of the Los Angeles Youth Action Union, also known as Youth for Peace and Socialism. This group was organized by Southern California Communist Party Chairman Dorothy Healy. Both of the Goldbergs were arrested at the San Francisco sit-in.

The announcement that the Goldbergs would be called before the faculty committee on student conduct was the rallying point for the December second demonstration.

- **Richard M. Schmorleitz**, Press Secretary for the FSM, is the son of Robert J. Schmorleitz, a member and former officer in the National Lawyers Guild. The Guild has been cited as a Communist Front; indeed, as “The foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party.” The Guild was also extremely active in Mississippi last summer. Newsmen commented that the younger Mr. Schmorleitz’s press releases always arrived beautifully typed and professionally copied on a Xerox machine.

The big drive behind the Ad Hoc Committee to End Discrimination grew out of the formation of the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America. W.E.B. DuBois, it will be recalled, was the co-founder of the NAACP who finally decided in his late years to announce that he was a Communist. Thereupon
Du Bois left America in disgust, flew to Ghana, kissed the soil as he got off the plane, and collapsed in the arms of Kwame, the Redeemer, Nkrumah. To honor this hero of the American Revolution, Gus Hall decreed the formation of the DuBois Clubs in October of 1963. A national convention was planned for Chicago in December, but the date was switched to San Francisco in June, in order to find a more acceptable atmosphere.

In San Francisco, a pilot model of the DuBois Clubs had already been operating since shortly after the arrival of Miss Aptheker in the fall of 1962. With the help of the wealthy Marxist lawyer, Vincent Hallinan, and his sons, the club organized the groups' national convention for June 19-21, 1964. The objective stated by Hall and cited by J. Edgar Hoover was to form a national Marxist network of student agitators. The convention found a very acceptable atmosphere in a union hall of the Communist-controlled international longshoreman's union.

Like the Free Speech Movement, the national headquarters of the DuBois Clubs has a member of SNCC for its President, one Phil Davis, who was a SNCC Field Secretary during the summer. Chairman of publications is Carl Bloice, a reporter for the People's World, West Coast version of the Worker. Mr. Bloice was recently in Moscow to confer about the recruiting of students for the Communist World Youth Festival, to be held in Algiers.

However, it was the East Bay Chapter of the DuBois Clubs which was directly active in the Free Speech Movement. Its roster of officers is worthy of note:

- Phyllis H. Haberman, Chairman, is another roommate of Bettina Aptheker, and was arrested at the San Francisco sleep-in.
- Conn, Matthew, and Terence Hallinan are respectively Public Relations Chairman, Education Committee Chairman, and Social Chairman. They are all sons of Vincent Hallinan, the lawyer active in Leftwing legal causes, who has joined with Herbert Aptheker in organizing a Marxist study institute.
- Ann Goldblatt King and Lee Goldblatt are the daughters of Louis Goldblatt, identified Communist Secretary-Treasurer of Harry Bridges' longshoremen's union. The Goldblatt girls, both club officers, also participated in the San Francisco demonstration.

And finally, there is the curious organization called Slate. Slate is the breeding place for Leftist thinking on campus. Many of the leaders in the 1960 anti-HCUA riots were Slate-men. The Hallinans were active in Slate. The President of the Young Democrats, Ted Cohen, has been an officer of Slate. And the Free Speech Movement fairly bristled with prominent members of Slate:

- Ken Cloke, now a law student, has written by-lined material for the People's World: he is the son of two veteran Leftists, Richard and Shirley Cloke. The son was once Chairman of Slate.
- Mike Tigar, a veteran of the anti-HCUA riots, attended the Communist Youth Festival in Helsinki, and has written for People's World and another Communist publication, New Horizons for Youth. Mr. Tigar was also a Slate Chairman.
- Robert Kaufman, a Slate regular, is a local officer of CORE, and a former member of the defunct Fair Play for Cuba Committee and SNCC. Mr. Kaufman, a graduate student in history, is currently organizing a "labor union" for teaching assistants. He was also listed as a member of the national council of the U.S. Festival Committee for the Communist Youth Festival in Vienna.

Another teacher in the University of California History Department has also been taking part in the student demon-
strations. He is Robert Starobin, son of identified Communist Joseph Starobin, at one time Foreign Editor of the Daily Worker. Miss Aptheker is majoring in history in Mr. Starobin's department.

Now it so happens that one of the curious projects of Slate is a rating service on the various courses offered, based on a poll of the students. It is democracy applied to learning, as it enables students to determine which courses are the easiest. And as students enrolled for classes last fall, those who bought Slate's recommendations also got Slate's supplement report, written by Slate's elder statesman (at the ripe old student age of thirty-one), Herbert B. Cleaveland. In the light of the revolution that broke out within two weeks after publication, Mr. Cleaveland's comments may be of significance:

Dear Undergraduates... I will entreat you to furiously throw [sic] your comforting feelings of duty and responsibility for this institution to the winds and act on your situation. This institution, affectionately called "Cal" by many of you, or as the Daily Cal might put it, "the Big U," does not deserve a response of loyalty and allegiance from you. There is only one proper response to Berkeley from undergraduates: that you organize and split this campus wide open.

From this point on, do not misunderstand me. My intention is to convince you that you do nothing less than begin an open, fierce, and thoroughgoing rebellion on this campus... if such a revolt were conducted with unrelenting toughness and courage, it could spread to other campuses across the country and cause a fundamental change in your own futures.

Slate listed eight demands as the goals of the rebellion. They all began with the word "Immediate." Slate asked nothing less than the total elimination of the course-grade-unit system of teaching (used in all American universities). Slate wanted the elimination of dorm and living group rules which prescribed hours; elimination of student-imposed discipline; and better teaching. Slate also wanted the elimination of Clark Kerr, and "reconstitution of the Board of Regents, either through firing or expansion." And Slate's methods were already in sight:

Go to the top. Make your demands to the Regents. If they refuse to give you an audience: Start a program of agitation, petitioning, rallies, etc., in which the final resort will be civil disobedience. In the long run there is the possibility that you will find it necessary to perform civil disobedience at a couple of major University public ceremonies...

If it is necessary to go this far beyond formal "channels" and if you have the guts to get there, you will begin to learn how tough it is to effect radical change...

And if you get this far you will also have witnessed nation-wide publicity which will have exposed Berkeley for the undergraduate sham that it is. Not to say that the public in general will feel that way, what with the press "red-baiting" you, but that students all over the country will read between the lines. By this time you may also be able to call for a mass student strike, something which seems unthinkable at present.

Less than a month later, the unthinkable was in effect, along with the nation-wide publicity. And by calling TH 8-2930 anytime, day or night, a voice at the FSM central exchange could tell you where to locate Mario Savio or Jack
Weinberg, in case they were needed for emergency demonstrations or photographs. The Press dutifully reported that it wasn’t a case of radicalism at all, but just a bunch of healthy kids reacting against the terrible system. Now, what you couldn’t learn from the central exchange was the exact whereabouts of such non-students as these, who were nevertheless photographed on campus:

- **Mortimer Scheer**, co-founder of the hard-line Progressive Labor Movement. A pro-Pekingese, he was expelled from the Communist Party, U.S.A., for militancy; on campus he passed out copies of his newspaper, *Challenge*.
- **Mickey Lima**, father of Margaret Lima, and Northern California CPUSA boss.
- **William Mandel**, an identified Communist, and a commentator for radio station KPFA. Mandel is known to have participated in Free Speech Movement strategy sessions.
- **Howard Jeter**, a Communist-backed candidate for Congress in 1962, and an adherent of Herbert Aptheker. He has spoken for the *National Guardian*, a hard-line Communist Front newspaper in New York, and for a birthday testimonial to identified Communist Front newspaper in New York, and for a birthday testimonial to identified Communist Jean Kramer, Executive Director of the Communist-run Northern California Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born.

None of these connections or personalities seemed apparent to the national Press and the national correspondents, whose interest began and ended with Mario Savio. A few did notice. They were Charles Fox, the former University of California teacher, with his shrewd anti-Communist weekly, *Tocsin*, in Oakland; Ed Montgomery, in the *Los Angeles Herald Examiner*; and E. Richard Barnes, the California Assemblyman from the Seventy-Eighth District. Eventually, the word filtered back.

But Mario Savio, thanks to the national publicity and the network of DuBois Clubs, made a triumphant tour of Midwestern and Eastern universities. When asked at the airport about Mr. Barnes’s charges, he said modestly, “I resent the Communist Party getting credit for the Free Speech Movement’s action.” At his side, Miss Aptheker no doubt smiled.

A “Liberal’s” Education


The singlemost characteristic of the “Liberal” mentality is its openness; its boast is to admit all comers. But when the mind is perpetually open, truth flows out as easily as it flows in—a glittering goldfish darting through a piece of ossified coral in a fish bowl. One proposition is as good as another, perhaps even better, as long as the arguments are unexamined. Whatever a “Liberal” possesses, its mere possession is considered an encumbrance. Whatever is “my own” is deemed inferior. And of course, the “Liberal” knows best.

When this outlook is transmitted to a whole system of education, the result is paralysis. The essence of the attitude is doubt; and the presumption of democracy is that the individual can never attain enough truth to act alone. The hope is that truth resides somewhere in the collective, a whole school of fish swimming through a coral reef. Naturally, this means that the truths of intellect are relative to what your neighbor knows, feels, or acts upon. And your
neighbor’s knowledge changes too.

The freedom to refrain from acknowledging truth is what the “Liberal” mistakenly calls individualism. The single moral imperative of this mentality is to keep the mind open; and since the individual depends on the collective system, the “Liberal” has a frenzied militancy to open the minds of others, and keep them open. The theoretical viability of the whole system depends upon everyone embracing it. Suppose someone closed his mind on the truth; wouldn’t that deprive someone else?

The insistence on openness, the doubt that any individual really has enough certitude to act on his own, and the paradoxical assertion that the individual has a right to reject traditional value systems, lies at the heart of all “Liberal” programs: anti-censorship campaigns, disarmament, world government, democratic equality and its corollary, the “Civil-Rights” movement. But it is especially evident in education, for to the “Liberal” mind, education and “Liberalism” are identical.

Education is thought of as the process of shoving as many ideas as possible through the mind, opening the mental capacities to the free flow of knowledge. Education is justified as a direct benefit to the individual, and a necessary prerequisite for a collective society. Education is described as preparation for citizenship, and it is asserted that education never stops. Indeed, education of everybody, as long as possible, is the practical expression of the moral commitment to the open system. These notions are false.

For running through them all is the underlying concept of utility, that education is only a means to something else, self-improvement or social benefit. “Liberals” assert that education must be useful in the highest and most enlightened sense; but it is not long before the taxpayers for state universities begin to demand that education be useful in the most practical sense too. All subjects are held democratically equal and appropriate, as long as they are useful. All facts are equal, and the only concern is to get as many as possible to keep the mind open. Method is sought rather than philosophy: scientific method in which the mind is a sorter and accumulator of all the facts.

Instead of education, the result is instruction, which imparts facts and trains in method. Today’s universities are vocational-technical institutes tuned up to the output of the engineers, scientists, scientific scholars, hotel managers, grammarians, city planners, historiographers, language technicians, managers of mobile home parks, social workers, and journalists needed by a technological society. Even philosophy and Latin professors are retained on the grounds that, with the population explosion, they are needed to turn out more philosophy and Latin teachers. A recent nationwide sample by the University of Michigan’s Survey Research Center (itself a symptom of the problem) revealed the obvious: namely, that by far the majority of students in college have as their prime motivation the attainment of a job with a high income. That is a respectable enough ambition, but it must not be confused with education.

The traditional Western view of education is that it is useless. Education must not obtrude on practical affairs. By itself, it does not make a man morally good, and it is no consolation in distress. Education is the cultivation of intellect for its own sake.

By intellect is meant not the shaping of a single man’s intelligence, but the whole tradition of intellect that is the chief distinction of Western man. It is the tools of learning invented and enlarged by successive intelligences. It is the power of discursive reasoning, the construction of systems, the development of abstract concepts. Other civi-
lizations have been noteworthy for artistic or political achievements, but the peculiar vitality of Western civilization has been because of its ability to retain and improve upon its systems of law and language, logic and history, philosophy and theology. This subsisting wisdom, with its certitude of absolute values, and the subordination of all human intelligences not to each other but to a hierarchy of values, is the world of intellect.

"Liberalism" is anti-intellectual. A proper education denies equality both in ideas and in men. Not everyone can enter the world of intellect, because then the world of action would be in a terrible mess. Education cannot begin until all the practical affairs of the world have been taken care of. A proper education requires a leisured class, which the "Liberals" abhor; or a class of devoted poor clerks, which the "Liberals" pity. It requires a feeling for truth, a conviction of certitude, and the humbling of the individual mind before the body of wisdom. But it also requires the conviction that sometimes, in some ages, only one man, an Athanasius say, upholds the orthodoxy of intellect against the whole world. That much for the open mind.

But the "Liberal" is also anti-intellectual because he denies intellect and substitutes science. Intellect is concerned with the non-material world; it is the world of thought, judgment, knowing, and discursive reason. Science is concerned with the physical facts of the universe, attainable by the senses or the electron microscope. As a valuable method, it has taught us a lot about the physical universe; it has taught us nothing about the subsisting world of intellect.

To be sure, there are a few men in the modern American universities who pursue the goals of intellect. But the institutions and the students are shaped by the twin doctrines of utility and equality. The physical sciences are obviously much more closely related to the practical world than to the world of intellect. In large universities, the income from research projects is commonly half or more of the total budget (at the University of California, the radiation laboratories get $227 million; income from all other eight campuses is $250 million). Every department demands its equal share; one department of hotel management at a large university spent thousands of dollars on the mutual standardization of baking pans and commercial ovens.

Even the humanities are scientized by scholar-vulgarians; and such "research" is regarded by practical-minded administrators as proof that a professor is working instead of merely wading in the public trough. Besides, the advertising value is considerable: Two book reviews are as good as a scholarly article, and a worthless textbook used by freshmen across the country will garner more prestige than a solid but esoteric book—if the author's name and college affiliation are prominently displayed.

The students themselves are bedeviled by their own numbers, the result of the doctrine that everyone is obligated to be trained to his utmost, so as to be useful to society. They find that one course counts as much as another; that "psychology" will satisfy the science requirement as fitly as physics, and that Spanish is just as good as Greek. The faculty looks on the students as equals in the advancement of knowledge; certainly, the students quickly consider themselves as the faculty's equals.

Since "Liberalism" is primarily an intellectual disease, it is particularly virulent in the universities. It is no wonder that American universities are the seats of the ban-the-bombers, the civil righters, and the Committee to Save the World from American Bêtality. "Liberals" like to think of themselves as the "intellectuals," but their
open mind is a sinister attack on the philosophy of intellect. Truth is an obstacle to the free flow of ideas. It demands value and subordination.

But for the “Liberal,” the tools of intellect are turned on intellect itself. Reason is used to open up, divide, cut off, set loose the systems articulated by minds more comprehensive than those of one generation. The “Liberal” sees this perpetual loosening as the object of intellect; yet it prevents the growth of thought and the continuance of civilization. The mass of men have always regarded “Liberal intellectuals” as inherently subversive. They are.

Yet the culture of the mind is not subversive, even though it is not given to everyone to participate in it consciously. Every healthy organism grows by expansion and contraction; it both admits and excretes. The healthy mind is not perpetually relaxed like a muscle flaccid under anesthesia. It distinguishes according to a philosophy of truth cultivated by reasonable men over generations; it admits ideas only when they correspond to reality. The “Liberal” must admit every idea, leaving the decision, if any, to the principle of utility, the common good, or social welfare. The consecutive progress of these components of “Liberalism” is vividly illustrated in the career of the architect of modern “Liberalism,” John Stuart Mill, who began as a utilitarian, softened into the classical statement of his On Liberty, and ended his career expounding Socialism.

The rate of degeneration of a mind or a whole culture is determined by the energy of the intellect in admitting new ideas, the chance availability of erroneous concepts, and the good luck of not meeting up with a conspiracy of evil. The “Liberal” mind has but one criterion for rejecting an idea: If it threatens the very root of the open system, that is to say, “Liberalism” itself. This explains the paradox of the “Liberal’s” violent and illiberal opposition to a conservative philosophy of values and standards. The “Liberal” can tolerate the reactionary, the sterile stand-patter, because it is only a question of time until these people die, compromise, or give up. But the conservative philosophy is a prima facie contradiction of the one essential belief of “Liberalism.”

On the other hand, the “Liberal” feels he can tolerate the Communist because the Communist is also interested in the shake-up of the old order. The “Liberal’s” passive attitude, his unshakeable belief in the desirability of shaking things up, leads him to doubt that Communists have ulterior motives. Communists seem to be too far away, or too few to be effective. Besides, Communists are just as apt to have that fleeting moment of circulating truth in which the “Liberal” believes all men participate.

The danger, then, appears to be not that Communism might destroy “Liberalism,” but that “Liberalism” might destroy itself by denying its one fundamental principle. When a group of men are rocking the boat together, it is extremely difficult to tell who is rocking for the fun of rocking, or who is rocking for the wrecking. The “Liberal” never opposes Communism until he is hit by the wreckage.

The Berkeley Syndrome

All of these symptoms are particularly extravagant at Berkeley. And although Berkeley may seem exceptional now, it must be remembered that the “Liberal” direction is always toward a further loosening up. The extraordinary worship of science at Berkeley, the specialization, the size of the enrollment, and the de-emphasis of the student all contributed to the atmosphere of the rebellion. Equality of values means anarchy. With intellect itself ignored, and a growing presentment of disillusionment, the way was prepared
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for the false prophets of Slate. With no common standard of judgment, there can be no synthesis of learning, no university. Clark Kerr is right in naming his "multiversity."

The Free Speech Movement is the quintessence of the "Liberal" mentality. It received the support not only of the students but of many faculty members, particularly the young teaching assistants who caught the wind from the administration. In 1961, after the HCUA riots had focused national attention on the Leftist influence at Berkeley, Governor Edmund G. Brown, a certified "Liberal," sanctioned the demonstrations and subsequent disturbances with the following "Liberal" comment:

Far from discouraging your students' social and public interests, I propose that you positively exploit them ... I say: thank God for the spectacle of students picketing, even when they are picketing me at Sacramento and I think they are wrong, for students protesting and Freedom-Riding, for students listening to society's dissidents, for students going out into the fields with our migratory workers, and marching off to jail with our segregated Negroes. At least we're getting somewhere. The colleges have become bootcamps for citizenship—and citizen leaders are marching out of them ... . If America is still on the way up, it will welcome this new, impatient, critical crop of young gadflies. It will be fearful only of the complacent and passive.

Here the Governor displays all the tagends of "Liberalism," even to implying that good citizenship and "Liberalism" are the same thing. Last December, it was a dazed Governor Brown who ordered out the police against his young gadflies. He finally got "somewhere."

In 1961 also, President Kerr displayed the same touching faith in the strength of the open society. "The University is not engaged in making ideas safe for students," he said. "It is engaged in making students safe for ideas." And again: "Our American ideals are not fragile objects ... to be sheltered from the reality of today's world. They are strong and resilient and as serviceable today as in 1776. They need no special care except daily exercise, and no shield but truth." By 1964, Clark Kerr admitted that his "American ideals"—a cant term for "Liberalism"—had been penetrated by a "Castro-Mao-Tse-tung influence." He did not seem to be able to distinguish the Moscow-directed Communists from the authentic "Liberals."

Yet Clark Kerr and "Liberalism" were directly responsible for the situation that the Communists exploited at Berkeley. Early in 1963, after agitation by Slate and the DuBois Club, the University dropped the ban against Communist speakers on campus. Now students could liberally admire their Reds right on campus, instead of crossing the street to hear them at the YMCA, because the cell of agitators we have described lost no time in getting their parents and friends to take advantage of the lifted ban. Naturally, for this bona fide "Liberal" action, President Kerr proudly received the "Alexander Meikeljohn Award" from the American Association of University Professors. The award seemed appropriate because Professor Meikeljohn, since deceased, was one of the foremost exponents of the open society, even to the extent of serving as Honorary Chairman of several Communist Fronts—most notably those advocating "free speech," such as the National Committee to Abolish HCUA.

Encouraged by the aforementioned victories for "free speech," the cell next took up the case of Eli Katz, who held a temporary position in the German De-
partment last year. Katz was refused reappointment because he would not answer the questions he avoided under the Fifth Amendment before HCUA. A 1959 HCUA Report identifies him as a member of the Southern California District Council of CPUSA, a delegate to the 1957 Los Angeles County Communist Party Convention, and a longtime activist in the Communist youth movements. Chancellor Strong refused to re-hire him.

But while the case of Katz was under discussion—it too was referred to a committee under the “Liberal” dictum that no one has the truth—the free speech movement found better fodder in the politicking ban, which proved to be more effective in getting rid of Strong. To some observers, the sudden and arbitrary clamping down of the ban seemed to be either poor strategy in student discipline, or a deliberate provocation designed to create sympathy for “free speech.” The action does seem inexplicable in a university whose ideals need no special care but daily exercise. The final result means that there will be less control than ever over the students; and certainly the new Chancellor will think twice before angering his students by doing anything so un-American as refusing to hire Communist professors. Free speech is free speech.

The idyllic postlude to the whole affair ends not in Berkeley but in a wretched prison hospital in Algiers. There lie the battered but breathing remains of one Ronald Ramsey, a student who exhibited the whole “Liberal” catalogue. Mr. Ramsey was a psychologist with an open mind. At Berkeley, he had been a part of the Free Speech Movement. He was a pacifist, a “Civil-Rights” worker, and a passionate believer in “African socialism.”

It came to pass that Mr. Ramsey fell in with Michel Raptis, a cabinet officer in Ben Bella’s brand of Sino-Soviet Communism. This Raptis invited Mr. Ramsey to work for the revolution; and Mr. Ramsey enthusiastically went to Algeria. Alas, Raptis fell from favor, and Mr. Ramsey fell into suspicion. He was set upon by the comrades, beaten, dragged off to prison as a CIA agent, tortured to the extent that he had to be put in the prison hospital, and held incommunicado for six weeks. Allowed an interview at last, he had one statement; and it is the statement that “Liberals” always must make in the end: “I find myself damned dismayed, frightened, ill of health, and tired.”

CRACKER BARREL

■ EAGLE ROCK—Sometimes I think the Communists must be trying to make monkeys out of their apologists in this country. For years the anti-anti-Communists have been telling us about the growing “rift” between the Red Russians and the Red Chinese. But at the first sign of a crisis, they stand shoulder to shoulder.

■ EAGLE ROCK—When I first asked a girl to marry me, she hesitated. “But why?” I persisted. “There isn’t anyone else, is there?” “Oh!” she said, bursting into tears, “there must be.”

■ EAGLE ROCK—Why do so many writers favor Communism when Communism seldom favors the writers? The Richmond News Leader points out that the Russian language version of the musical “My Fair Lady” has been a hit in Moscow, Odessa, and Leningrad, but so far the Communists, who don’t recognize international copyright law, have failed to pay a nickel in royalties. Attempts to negotiate are said to have been ignored, since the Muscovites are busy preparing their own version of Leonard Bernstein’s “West Side Story,” for which they’ll also pay no royalties. Russian artists work for the Communist state and the Soviets seem to think all other artists should do the same thing.

—Jack Moffitt
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