

FIRING LINE - PROGRAM # 185 - GUEST: DANIEL BOORSTIN

BUCKLEY:

Professor Daniel Boorstin is an anomaly on the academic scene because not only is he superbly documented as a scholar and as a free (?), a social scientist, but he is also adamant in his denunciation of what one loosely calls the New Left. Indeed, one might call him the Spiro Agnew of the HighBrows. His new book, a tiny little book, could just possibly cause a renewal of the Common Sense that Thomas Paine enjoined on us 200 years ago. It is called The Sociology of the Absurd, an elaborate jape in a few dozen pages. Mr. Boorstin has elsewhere explained why he believes that the New Left we are familiar is something quite different from those who have disagreed with American doctrine and idealism over the years. The new breed, he says, are barbarians. Men who care not for experience, but for sensation, men and women, boys and girls, who just might, in the opinion of Professor Boorstin, finally achieve what others have not succeeded in achieving, namely, the destruction of American society from within. Daniel Boorstin's academic credentials are too much. He is a Georgia boy, brought up in ~~OK~~ Oklahoma, schooled at Harvard, ~~XXXX~~ Rhodes Scholar at Oxford, law degree at Yale, Professor of History and Political Science, teacher and professor at Swarthmore at the University of Chicago, winner of every prize you can think of for such books as The Genius of American Politics, and The Colonial Experience, and Director ~~of~~ now of the National Museum

The copyright laws of the United States (Title 17, U.S. Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. If a user makes a request for, or later uses a photocopy or reproduction (including handwritten copies) for purposes in excess of fair use, that user may be liable for copyright infringement. Users are advised to obtain permission from the copyright owner before any re-use of this material.

Use of this material is for private, non-commercial, and educational purposes; additional reprints and further distribution is prohibited. Copies are not for resale. All other rights reserved. For further information, contact Director, Hoover Institution Library and Archives, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305-6010

© Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Jr. University.

in Washington. We're here to discuss dissent. And I should like to begin by asking Dr Boorstin to be so kind as to explain his distinction between disagreement and dissent.

BOORSTIN:

Well, first, if I may, Mr. Buckley, I would like to try to focus attention on the positive on the ~~xx~~ idea of community, which is, has been my starting point in much of my writing, and which I think we tend to forget about these days; because the idea of community is, the experience of community, is what holds us together, and what has helped us build this country. Now, I think that if we start with the idea of community then we can easily make a distinction between dissent and disagreement. I define disagreement as the exchange of views over how to obtain the common ends of the community. Dissent I identify with the, through its Latin origin, with a feeling of separateness, the emphasis on that which separates, rather than that which unites people. And I think that there has been a tendency to create a cliché, a new cliché in America, which is that it's good for people to feel and emphasize their separateness from all other people; and I think that much of what is glorified under the name of dissent is really the exclamatory expression of the self and this is clearly to be distinguished from the pursuit of common ends by the suggestion of alternative ways of reaching those ends.

BU: Well, now, isn't that analysis susceptible to the argument that you are making primarily a semantical point? Or, would you reply that in fact what you hear is dissent of the kind that you have just described. That people don't want society to survive, but want rather to atomize society?

BO: Well, I don't think it's a semantic difference, if by that you mean it's a just a difference over words I think there is a difference between the efforts to bring all people into the American community to have a more total view of our economy and of the participation of people in it, on the one hand, and on the other hand, an insistence on the glorification of the peculiarity^{ies} of individual races and ethnic origins and religions and so on. I think that we have been a pluralistic society, we have accomplished what we have by drawing people together, and not by separating them. Many of the people who came to this country ~~has~~ have come from nations which were fighting wars against one another for centuries. And one of the ~~the~~ great American achievements was to make it possible for these people who came with different languages and often different religions, different races, to engage in a common enterprise, And that's the glory of the American city which in this respect is different from many cities elsewhere in the world. So, I think that our problem is to ~~rediscover~~ rediscover

community, to find ways of emphasizing what holds us together. And I think that the emphasis on dissent, the tendency to glorify dissent, is really related to some deep tendencies in American history, especially recent history. I think that, in the firstplace, the development of the social sciences, sociology and the study of minorities -- in fact, I would call sociology the science of minorifies as it's developed in this country in the last half-century or so -- the development of the science of minorities, the study ^{the} of/peculiar characteristics of different groups in our society, has tended to accentuate this feeling of separateness. And there's been an interesting movement I think in the last half-century or so, from assimilation to what I would call integration. In the last years of the 19th Century and the early years of this century, much of the discussion of the relation of the immigrant and ethnic groups to American life took the form of the effort to Americanize the immigrant. That was the idea. To find pathways into the whole community. And then in the middle of the 20th Century, well, I would say beginning in the ^{of} 1930's about the time/the depression, and reaching a climax in the fifties and sixties, there has been an emphasis on integration. Integration, I would describe as a somewhat different ~~ex~~ ideal. While assimilation emphasizes the right of every American to take part ~~exxx~~ in the main-

stream, to flow into the stream of American life, integration insists on his right to be integral, an integer, a separate individual, and this has its dangers which are expressed in the form of racism, ~~in~~ white or black~~xx~~ racism, in the glorification and the falsification of the past~~xx~~ of one's own group in order to build up one's ego. Now, this movement from assimilation to integration, along with the rise of the science of minorities, which has informed every minority group in this country of where it stands how numerous it is, also helps it discover where it can use its power.

BU: Could you be concrete about that? That is to say, could you give us an example of who or what you are referring to who is making these emphases?

BO: Well, I would say that Gunnar Myrdal's American Dilemma, for example, which was a very important and very useful book, which was a study of the place of the ~~Ameri~~ Negro selfconsciousness, in American life, was a step toward the ~~selfconsciousness~~ the sociological selfconsciousness, of this particular minority. And I think that we can trace the movement in many other ways when Eznonyeki (?) and Thomas, who were Chicago sociologists, by the way, made their study of the Polish peasant in Europe and America. They were interested in the peculiarities of the Polish experience. But it was not a statistical study and then in the beginning, in the 1920's and '30's, with the rise of market research,

of a the
and the/more sophisticated study of/American population,
people began to describe where the different immigrant~~xx~~
groups were. Now, this had its beginnings really in the
anti-immigrant movement, in the Anglo-Saxon superiority
movement at the end of the 19th Century, when the
Immigration Restriction League, which by the way had the
support of some of the most respectable, almost all of
the most respectable intellectuals in the country, at the
time, including John R. Commons, ~~Sullivan~~ the labor historian, and
many others , that movement led to the accumulation of
statistics about immigration. And there were about 40
volumes published of Congressional hearings which emphasized
the peculiar characteristics of different immigrant groups.
This was a rather rudimentary and, as we would see it now,
a rather unenlightened approach to the subject. But
gradually, sociologists began to, as they studied the
American city, began to see where the different immigrant
groups lived, and then as voter science arose, as people
began to study opinion polling, in, ^{as} Elmo Roper and Gallup
and others, began to study the relation of the background
of a person to the way he voted, they began to ~~xxxx~~ locate
different groups and it soon became possible for a person
of any ethnic group to know how numerous his group was, if
they were Italians, or Polish-Americans, or Jews, or Negroes,
and this was the kind, they were in a way performing the

function of the CIA, shall we say, for every minority. And minorities now didn't need to be puzzled over how powerful they were or where their power could be exercised. Then, they began to know.

BU: Well, does the logic of that lead to the assertion by all minorities, of powers, now that they have identified themselves as minorities?

BO: Well, it produces a temptation, you see, and I think that the great movement has been from the emphasis on the majority to the emphasis on minorities, and, for example, if you will look at some of the recent summaries of social science, Merrillson & ~~Stein~~ Steiner's (?) Inventory of the Social Sciences of the last ~~half~~ half-century or so, they indicate that the movement in the study of society has been from the study of society as a whole or larger social groups to the study of minorities. And this inevitably tends to lead people, when they discover where they are located and that they do have power to think that the exercise of that power is a good thing.

BU: Is the logical thing to do.

BO: So that while, and it also has destroyed a feature of the ^{was} of majority rule, which/I think ~~is~~ as old as democracy, and that is what I would call the mystery of the majority. One of the reasons why majority rule had its appeal was that people were never quite certain what made it up, and

the ballot box was a kind of sacrament in which people

BU:

Discuss (BOTH TALKING SIMULTANEOUSLY)

BO:

participated in ~~this~~ this mystery, you see? The ballot box was, gradually came to be considered sacred and you never knew what the voice of the people was until it was spoken. The voice of the people is the ~~ex~~ voice of God. And the fact that it was hard to discover that voice tempted people to think that there was something sacred about it. But now,

(?)

BU:

You're thinking/of transsubstantiation

BO:

Well, exactly. And the ballot box is what created that ~~xxx~~ trans-substantiation. But now, of course, the actual election itself is a kind of verification of the polls.

BU:

Right. Excuse me one second.

BREAK

BU:

Well, Mr Boerstin, applying your analysis and other analyses that you have made to the dissenters of today, who do you think of as sort of the archetypal dissenter? The SDS people, or who sort of flashes in mind, to your mind, to your imagination, when you think of people who are leading the dissenting movement of today?

BO:

Well, I would like, before I answer that question directly, I would like to make a qualification, to make, and carry on the historical explanation here, because I would like to avoid putting a finger on any group I think that

the rise of minority consciousness growing out of the
growth of social sciences ^{was} ~~xx~~ one thing, but there was
another element that was very important, and that was
the change in American technology, which we are participating
in here on television, and which had many ramifications
which were very important. The rise especially of what
I would call flow technology. Now, that made it possible
for an individual to stop the movement of traffic, or to
bollyx (?) up the machinery in a very simple way and the
symbol of that, of course, is the super-highway, or the
thruway, where, at the height of traffic a single stalled
car can cause a great deal of trouble and hold everybody
up. Now, I think that is ~~xxxx~~ a symbol of the new ~~power~~
power of the individual and of small groups so that every
individual and every member of a small group has a
temptation to

BU: Use his leverage.

BO: To use his leverage to bollyx up the works in order to
insist on what he, on his particular demand. Now, why, so
that from that point of view, I would say that it's not
it isn't accurate to put the finger on any particular group,
although we know which, that there are some groups that
have succumbed to the temptation more than others. But we
all have the temptation.

BU: Well, the, your thesis, as I understand it, is that the

impatience that people have for reform, if you like, is such as to cause them having discovered what kind of a muscle-hold they really have on society precisely to interfere with that flow, which is one of the distinctive ~~phen~~ phenomena ~~phenomena~~ of our time, and in the course of doing so, I think you once said that while trying to appear like St. Francis of Assissi, they actually reach for the crown of Napoleon. Now, well, first of all, what is to be done about it? That is to say, what is to be done about a society that treasures the right of the individual to be his own potty (?) little self and yet on the other hand still believes in the idea of the majority?

BO:

Well, I think that the answer is not suppression That is perfectly plain Now, the answer is to build ~~ex~~ community in every way we can, and that's one reason actually why I have come to the National Museum, where I have just recently become director, because I think that that is the kind of place where we can emphasize community. And I think that themore ways we find to dramatize the positive, to remind Americans of the great things we have been able to accomplish, we, to introduce the plural, the first person plural, we, together, have been able to accomplish, the more likely one is to be able to develop a ~~pride~~ pride in our civilization. Because at the same time that we have been, that our technology and our wealth has produced these phenomena I have described, there has

been a tendency to corrode the sense of pride, especially among the best educated groups in our ~~xx~~ community And I think that for a civilization to survive, people must be willing to be ~~xx~~ unashamedly proud of the positive achievements of their culture, and

BU: Well, now, why is this, why is there such ~~xx~~ alienation especially in the quarters you come from, the academic quarters, such that the people who are technically and intellectually best equipped to understand the fact of and American culture and of their, /the extent to which they become believable intellectual beings in virtue of their culture, why, precisely, do these people most reluctantly associate themselves with that culture?

BO: Well, I think that we are apt to forget what we've been trying and what we've been accomplishing in American education. We forget that education in America has been something quite different from what it ever was before anywhere. There's been no country of comparable size that ever tried to educate ~~xx~~ its whole citizenry. And this (?) has produced problems which were, have longly/recognized, I think Bliss Perry said the only way you can ever solve the problem of higher learning in America is to give every American citizen the Bachelor's Degree at birth.

BU: ~~ThexKexxex~~ A PhD at birth.

BO: Uh, well, that's progress, that,

BU: That's for the Democrats.

BO: Uh, well, this is part of the problem, you see We have attempted something that's never been attempted ~~something~~ before We've attempted education on a scale that's never been tried before The public school, the high school, ^{which in,} the public, free public high school, which is really an American invention, uh, and the college, which has reached out and become a gargantuan enterprise. You see, we ~~have~~ have around 7-million people enrolled in our institutions of higher learning. The faculty members Yeah.

BO: of our universities and colleges are over half a million, and are just about twice the total student enrollment in England or France Now, we're, we are not a nation of supermen, and I think that to believe that we can provide a half a million professors, liberally educated professors, uh is to believe that we're a nation of supermen. And I think the question is now what we can do ^{it}

BU: But isn't many of the best professors, quotes unquotes, at least the best formally qualified, using postulates

BO: Who do what?

BU: Who are, well, who are the mass men in the sense that uh

BO: Well, I don't know, I think there is a temptation in our society, created in part by the opinion polls and the media uh for everyone to be a follower. Now that we know what

the mass, we think we can test the way the crowd is going, the temptation is to be a leader by following the crowd. And I think that in academic life there are special problems, I think that it's giving away no secrets to say that many of the considerations that have led people to be professors are not their desire for the rough and tumble of life, and that being the case it's not surprising that when the heat's on and when threats are made, that professors are not always the bravest people, and so it goes. So, that we have to remember the context, that we're expecting the impossible of our society, and I think the question is how we can turn these ~~fx~~ vast institutions and the American hope for education to some constructive purpose. Uh, what use we can find for these enormous plants that we're building for the subsidizing of a large proportion of our population, uh, which I ~~xxxx~~ think in, ~~xx~~ one of the functions of which is to keep these seven million or seven and a half million people off the labor market and out of the Army. Uh, now, this of course is, I suppose, it's a necessary function now, because you can imagine what would happen if all those people entered the labor market suddenly, uh, not to mention what would happen if they all entered the Army. But, this is our problem. Our problem is that it's the vastness of the/ideal and its American vagueness which has, both of which characteristics have

been the glory of our civilization, and I think now one of the problems ~~ex~~ is, and we're suffering from the other side of this, in that we're inclined to attach, I think, probably too much importance to our universities in the total picture of American civilization. Uh, the functions that have been performed in our universities are essential to the development of American civilization, or any civilization, search, exchange, free exchange of ideas, and so on; but when certain institutions, like our colleges and universities, are less hospitable to some of those functions than they have been in the past, our society is flexible enough so that other places can be found where those activities can go on. And

BU: Such as where?

BO: Well, such as

BU: Museums?

BO: If you insist, yes. By all means, museums, by all means. And one of the great things about museums, of course, is that they are the free university~~ex~~ that we hear so much about. They are the underground university, they are the university of the people. When I stand outside the National Museum of History and Technology and look at the people coming in, I see people coming in without having to pay any tuition, they don't have to fill out any forms, they don;t have to

BU: No I.Q. tests

FIRING LINE - #185 - page 15

BO: Pardon?

BU: No I.Q. tests

BO: No, we're open every day of the year, except Christmas, and people of all shapes and sizes and races and sexes and ages come in, they're free to educate themselves. The university is not unique in providing opportunities for higher learning. We have the museums, we have our public libraries where some of our most resourceful Americans like Thomas Edison, for example, have received their, most of their education.

BREAK

BU: Uh, Mr. Boorstin, would you back up a moment and tell us again why it is that the universities are not fulfilling the function ~~of~~ that they were intended to fulfill? Is it because the enrollment is simply too high? That's the only reason I remember your mentioning.

BO: Well, I, uh, well, in the first ~~place~~ place I would say that people were not clear on what role they were intended to fulfill. In the more aristocratic societies, for example, in Great Britain, it was quite plain what function the universities were to fulfill. They were to provide a ruling class, an ~~educated~~ educated ruling class to ~~provide~~ ~~for~~ provide a staff for the Colonial service, /the Civil Service, for the universities, for the clergy, and so on. But in this country, I think that our system of higher education

was to, well the phrase I think in the twenties and thirties was to make contacts. And I think that that was to, that was about as accurate description of the vagueness of their aspiration as any. It was to provide people an opportunity to rise in the world, in any way that was possible, or that they could find. And so I think that the failure of universities to fulfill their aspiration, couldn't, shouldn't perhaps be called a failure. It should perhaps be called a reaching in many directions at once, and many of these aspirations and were attainable, it was possible, ~~xx~~ becomes increasingly possible to make a university degree accessible to large numbers of people, regardless of their income. It becomes possible to make the curriculum so easy that anyone can be awarded a degree even without the use of firearms

BU:

Well, okay, let's, yeah, I see your point. Let's grant that they've gotta be colleges in America, we must assume there have got to be colleges in America whose requirements are so lax that in fact they do not perform the function traditionally associated with a college education. But uh just as we have fifty percent of American eighteen-year-olds going to college now, whereas we had only ten percent in 1939, surely it's also true that the competition ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ of this world (?) for the Universities of Chicago, if this were, the, Harvard, is much keener and under the circumstances et cetera,

one would suppose that coming out of the University of Chicago, there would be a better class of men, from the point of view of what you're talking about. And, yet, that doesn't seem to be necessarily the case. Or is it the case?

BO:

Well, I think there are a number of movements going on at the same time. First, there is this ~~XXXX~~ tendency to uh, of the better universities to want to reenforce their standards, ~~AND~~ you mentioned the university of Chicago, which has had very high standards. But there are also pressures toward reversed discrimination, toward lowering the standards, in order to allow people to have the imprimatur of a degree, uh, to make out

BU:

In Chicago? In Chicago?

BO:

Uh, I'm not acquainted with the recent policies ^{at} ~~of~~/the university, because I left there some months ago, but I know there has been great resistance to this at the university, at the University of Chicago, I can't speak for the present policies. But the University of Chicago has stood for high standards, and I think that there have been pressures all over the country to changethe, that is to try to give a person a rubber stamp to make up for the disadvantage that he has suffered through his race, or through his poverty, ~~or~~ ~~through~~ through some other characteristic of his background Now, this, so that you

have the two pressures going on at the same time. And I think there's an increasing pressure toward the teaching of non-subjects. Uh, simply because there's a demand, student demand, or demand from some particular student group, such as Black ~~studies~~ Studies, for example, I give that as an example of the kind of thing, which I think is, should not be treated as a separate subject, and I think that the important thing is to make the educational program more total but not to try in this very odd way to make up for deficiencies or accidents of birth, by restricting the educational opportunity in ~~a~~ the university

BU:

No, I understand that, but here's what I'm trying to get at. If you ~~subtract~~ subtract from the student world those students who are frivolous, those who are intellectually not equipped to go to college, those others who go there merely to avoid working, or going into the Army or whatever, still, you've got some left over. Now, I want to talk about them for a minute, and ask you why it is that they who have the benefits of extraordinary educational opportunities and extraordinary educational resources and the best professors, why it is that they are coming out of college and aren't really behaving in a way that is absolutely satisfactory and have no sense at all, many of them, of this community that you speak of. Why haven't they picked it up from the college? And, once again,

a why do you have to go to a museum to instill in people
a sense of what it is to be an American?

BO: Well, I don't think that, in the first place I think
that those whom you describe as not taking advantage of
the of the opportunities that ~~and~~ there are in universities
are a very small minority~~ies~~. I think that most

BU: Okay, let's talk about small minorities

BO: of the students

BU: You've done that before

BO: in universities I think are still anxious to get an
education and are hard-working, and want to attend classes,
and so on I think that the that the situation is such,
though, that everybody has a distorted ~~ex~~ view of the
importance of the people who can make the most noise.
Because it's easier to make more noise with less
intellectual and other ~~qualifications~~ qualifications now than
it ever was before Uh, I think that television is a very
good example of it, and most of the, one of the consequences
of television has been to distort the importance of
different people in American public life, and for the
first time to give equal time to representatives of small
groups regardless of their qualifications. And the other
thing is that the resources for emphasizing community
have become weaker. That is, with television and the growth
of photography and, it ~~becomes~~ becomes less and less

interesting to present something that's static. It has to move, somebody has to ~~xx~~ be hitting somebody else or there has to be controversy, otherwise, it ~~xx~~ doesn't seem interesting. Now, in the past, the great institutions of most societies have been those which emphasized continuity, the main stream, or if you will, some of the static elements in the society, these were the universities, the churches and the family, to a certain extent. But more recently these agencies have tended to become, or to seem more and more square, because, simply because they have traditionnally emphasized continuity, and instead what makes life interesting, what's interesting to watch, is movement, activity, motion, and especially ~~xx~~ if ~~xxx~~ it's the motion of one person against another. And this, I think, gets things out of focus, it gives us a myopia, so we don't see those large tendencies which still hold Americans together, which still build our institutions, and which still, I think, dominate most of the students in our universities. And instead the emphasis is on commotion and what is sometimes called non-violence, or of course which, but which is another ~~gx~~ name/for violence these days.

BU: Explain that, will you?

BC: Well, uh, that, it really stems from something we were talking about earlier, which is the, some of the consequences of flow technology. There was a time when, if you wanted

to injure someone, you had to wave your arms, or shake a, hit him with something, but now, with the flow technology, all you have to do is ~~xxx~~ sit there and stall your car that And ~~ix~~ it isn't only in the traffic that/has to be the case When students can take possession of an administrative building, with its IBM machines/ turning out the salary checks of the faculty, and the Fellowship students, and that, say, a so on, ~~xxxxxx~~ monkey wrench in that machinery, it can stop the works, as indeed they have in quite a number of ~~xxxxxx~~ institutions. But this is, so that the distinction between violence and non-violence becomes harder and harder to make. The, the situation of a man stalling his car on the thruway is not one which Jesus had in mind. But a person who stalls his car can often do more damage than someone with a club.

BREAK

- BU: Mr. Boorstin, you wrote in one of your essays, one of our problems is that social scientists have increasingly led us to think that if the temptation to do something increases, people are more justified in doing it. Now, would you consider this to be a uh, self-evident?
- BO: Well, you mean do I think that is the correct proposition?
- BU: No, I didn't ask you that. I ask you whether you thought it was self-evident.
- BO: Self-evident that , I'm sorry,

BU: That the social scientists are in fact leading people to believe that that which is desired is desirable.

BO: Well, I don't know, of course, in this country we go on that the assumption ~~is~~/self-evident propositions somehow are more sacred than others.

BU: Yeah.

BO: But I don't, well, I don't know, perhaps I could shift your question a bit, see, if I, would an example of this be the notion that it is doubtful that people should be punished for committing crimes if it can be shown that the crime was in part a result of the environment in which they were raised?

BU: Well, that ~~was~~ would be an example.

BO: That would be an example

BU: Yes. Umhm.

BO: And that since, but of course in this kind of situation the word temptation is not relevant, is it? That is, you don't say that a person who has been disadvantaged and raised in an environment where he didn't have the opportunity to be taught the difference, the traditionally morality, shall we say, that that person is tempted in ~~xxxx~~ a direction, if temptation is (NOTH TALKING SIMULTANEOUSLY)

BU: Well, yes, you could say, you might say he's tempted to steal, let's say, if he is quotes disadvantaged

BO: Yes, well, the

BU: Or would you feel easier talking about, ~~xxxx~~ say, sex?

BO: Well, I think there, it's all the same, it's all of of a piece. The uh, the notion that, and I think that here again we come back to the rise of the Social Sciences, which have increasingly emphasized the total situation, uh, that is, beginning in the ~~xxxx~~ late 19th Century, and then gradually zeroed in on the circumstances that led a particular individual to perform ~~xxx~~ a ~~xxxx~~ particular act. And whereas formerly, I think~~xx~~, well, the old Christian adage was to understand all is to ~~ye~~ forgive all, the social science adage is to understand all is to blame society. This is the ~~nww~~ approach, and much of the studies of criminologists and social scientists lead in that direction. Now, it's a difficult problem because it's, you know, like the story of the man who had the formula for, a young man, it's a cliché story, a young man even had a formula for transforming ~~xxx~~ lead into silver, but it would only work if he did not think of a white elephant. Now, we, in a sense the social sciences become the white elephant, because we know that no one commits a crime unless he is motivated by a lot of circumstances and has been conditioned by his environment. And yet, you can't run a society and keep life peaceful and decent unless there are some rules and people are expected to obey them. And will the people continue to obey if they're not

punished for violating them?

BU: Well, now, what, when you say, a moment ago you said that you don't believe that suppression is ~~xxxxx~~ the way Now, are you distinguishing between suppression and repression?

BO: Well, I would make a distinction between the suppression of points of view or expressions of ideas within the customary traditions of the society for the exchange of ideas

BU: Yeah.

BO: on the one hand, and on the other hand enforcing the criminal laws of the society. I think there is a difference

BU: Uh huh, well, you believe

BO: But I don't think the enforcement of the criminal laws of the society, if the enforcement takes place within the Constitution and the restraints that we have in the United States, today, I don't consider that to be repression.

No, uh,

BU: ~~xxxxxx~~ Well, you believe in ostracism, don't you?, as a uniquely appropriate instrument through which to isolate and, if you like, discipline people who are totally recalcitrant, don't you?

BO: Well, would you amplify, ~~xxx~~ see/ whether, that we're living in the Greek same/century, (BOTH TALKING SIMULTANEOUSLY) the Greek civilization here.

BU: Well, you have, well, no, no, no, I didn't mean to exile them. But ostracism as it is currently used For instance,

should be our attitude towardx these people?

BU: I think that they should be allowed to preach civil disobedience. That's, there's no reason why they should not be allowed to preach civil ~~disobedience~~

BU: I didn't say they shouldn't be allowed, well, I'm trying to coax you back to saying something that you said about a year and a half ago, which I assume that you do not want to disavow, which is that people, that we should ostracize people who preach and practice civil disobedience.

BO: I don't remember having said

BU: Because, it was shortly after the death of Robert Kennedy. In an interview that you had with U. S News and World Report.

BO: Oh, I, yes,

BU: In which you discussed flow technology and also discussed the necessity to do ~~something~~ something about people who practiced civil disobedience, and ~~as~~ you used the word / ^{ostracism}

BO: Well, I don't think civil disobedience was a, I may be mistaken, but my recollection is that I did not refer to people whoxx practiced civil disobedience, but those who advocated the use of violence, which is different.

BU: Well, ex cept that in the same article you made, you insisted that it was impossible to distinguish between violence and non-violence in a flow technology.

BO: Well, I think it is possible to distinguish between violence

BU: -----violence.

BO: I think the common vocabulary, yes, so that I

BU: Martin Luther King was obviously non-violent, and yet,
in fact
violence did/ensue, didn't it, in many places that he,
where he expressed himself?

BO: Well, I think there is a difference between civil,
preaching civil disobedience and preaching violence Now,
I think that, and I think there's been a good deal o f
confusion about this, by seizing examples from all over the
world, without reference to the local context. For
example, people refer to Ghandi all the time in this
connection.

BU: Yeah.

BO: And Ghandi was preaching a technique for asserting the
powers of the majority of the people against a ruling
minority, namely, the British Colonial Government. Now,
that is a different, that is an entirely different context,
and I think it's very important to get these things in the
situation of the particular nation and time in which they
exist. Now, people have idealized ~~the~~ Thoreau, in our
history, for doing practically nothing, and taking no
risks, and it was not risky for Thoreau to refuse to pay
his poll tax

BU: He was bailed out by (BOTH TALKING SIMULTANEOUSLY) the
next day.

the sheriff was too lazy to let him out of jail that afternoon. But ~~he~~

BU: He didn't get a best seller out of it, though, did he?

BO: No. No, I think he once said that he had the largest library of his own works of any man of any author, and he pointed to his hut in Walden, and showed five or six hundred copies of *The Concord and the Merrimac*, but ~~xxx~~ this is, he was not an enormously popular writer in his own time. But I think that uh civil disobedience is a different, is a tradition which has many aspects to it, and I think that it's a mistake to abstract it, and treat it as if it were a universal thing, the same in all times and places. Now, I think people should be allowed to preach civil disobedience, I think people uh who preach incitement to riot, or who advocate violence, should suffer~~xx~~ the legal consequences. If it's incitement to murder, they should face those consequences. And I think our laws are adequate, if they're properly enforced, to cover those situations.

BREAK

BU: Mr. Greenfield.

GR: I want to know about something that you talked about very early, concerning the laws to deal with some of the later things you talked about anyway, and that is this notion of community. Uh, I was struck recently

in attending a lot of Rock concerts in New York by an extraordinary sense of community ~~xx~~ that existed precisely among those whom you would call, you know, you would characterize as feeling ~~xx~~ a sense of separation from ^{snapping} the/traditions of American life. ~~xxxx~~ One can contrast ^{football} ~~xx~~ let's say with a ~~football~~ game, where at a football ~~xx~~ game, ~~xxxxxx~~ everybody comes and drinks beer, and they parade, they play the National Anthem, and they honor Vietnam war veterans, and they crown beauty queens and it's all very American. At Rock concerts they would be booed if they played the National Anthem. The air is thick with marijuana, which is I suppose a form of civil disobedience in one sense, 20,000 people in Madison Square Garden committing an illegal act, Listening to music which in the eyes of the silent majority is subversive and perhaps immoral, And yet what I find is the sense of togetherness if you want to use that phrase, the sense that people are somehow sharing an experience which has a deep meaning is much greater than I've ever found at the more conventional kinds of gatherings, including political gatherings, and Fourth of July picnics, and such, in a sense in other words ~~xxxxxxx~~ the very alienation from the traditions which you seek to reaffirm have led at least in some cases ~~xx~~ to the sense of community which one really can't find, I think, in many of the more traditional American forums. Do you think that's a correct

perception of mine?

- BO: Well, I think you do have a point ¹ I think that there are many different ways of feeling community; but I think that the groups that, what I would suggest is that the, many of the most vocal groups trying to seek ~~xxx~~ power and trying to disrupt the flow of existing institutions are, do not have that sense of community, except in the quest of power. Now, I think it's ^a perfectly legitimate feeling of community. I think it's the kind of thing which has held the nation together, that's why the National Anthem is
- BU: I think he's talking about the sense of fraternity, which I think is different from the sense of community. Don't you?
- GR: No, I don't. I think ~~xx~~ I understand the distinction I'm really talking about a sense of community.
- BO: Well, how would you define sense of community?
- GR: A sense, I think the same way you would. I think it's a sense of tradition, although the traditions are relatively new, a sense of a common enterprise, a sense that those who are gathered here somehow are united in ways which go beyond the event of the moment. That they share, in other words, a whole outlook, and most of ~~xxx~~ that outlook is pretty negative about the basic American institutions that we now have, which somehow bring them together, almost that they are in a sense creating a separate, on-going nation, which is united more by ~~xxx~~

music and culture, I think, and by politics, than by anything else.

BO: Well, I think ~~xxx~~ that insofar as these groups are held together as you described, they are participating in the American tradition. They are square in that sense.

GR: Oh, surely, no, no, surely, that's specious. Now, you're simply defining away the ~~xxxxxx~~ prospect of alienation, leading to community.

BO: No, I

GR: (UNINTELLIGIBLE) they feel they must be part of the American experience.

BO: No, I'm not sure, why do you exclude the feeling of people at a football game from the sense of community as you describe

GR: Oh, I, no, I'm sorry,

BO: I had the understanding that you were distinguishing that from this other sense of community

GR: No, what I was saying was that those who were somehow exiles, self-defined exiles, have found in that exile what I consider, and this is a purely personal perception, a much more intense sense of this community, than I have felt from the kind of gathering we think of as in the grain (?).

BO: Well, I would say that it's possible to be held together in many ways, and I think that

GR: Low blow, low blow.

BO: Yeah, but I think the, it isn't only a question of whether people share their misery, which I think is part of it often, but it's also a question of whether they share a common end, and I think that the desire to burn it down, for example, is not a common end. The enjoyment of music together is an inarticulate kind of way of holding people together. I think the problem is how to transform this inarticulate sense of community ~~kx~~ if it exists, as I suspect it probably does, how to transform that into something constructive and positive. But when these when people who ~~XXXXX~~ feel that sense of community when they're listening to a piece of music do not feel it when it comes to their government or to their political life, then there is something missing, and that is the gap which I think we must try to fill. And I think, moreover, that there are a lot of people, perhaps many more than those of us who come from academic life, or who spend much time in universities would believe, there still remains a very large sense of community among the bulk of the American people about the mainstream of our, of history.

BU: Mr. Ulshaker (?) .

UL: Yes, Mr. Buckleyxx spoke earlier in the program about dissent, and you addressed yourself to it for a few minutes, rather nebulously I think. I'd like to know if

you would call dissent such as the 1963 Civil Rights March, or even the 1968 rioting after Martin Luther King's death, and that of , say, a building takeover at a college, which, admittedly, might gain very little. I think you talk about the minority groups beginning to assert themselves now, and you don't appear to treat this as a very healthy sign. But I want to know what, if a lot of the things that have come across as a result of this dissent, such ~~xx~~ legislation ^{as} ~~xx~~the 1964, I think it was, Civil Rights Act, and 1968 Open Housing Act, that this all would have happened if it wasn't for this dissent, violent or otherwise.

BO:

Well, I think there are several questions, Mr Ulshaker, I think ~~thxxxx~~ they are all interesting. I think the, the first question is how you distinguish between dissent and disagreement, which is what Mr Buckley was, the question Mr. Buckley was raising earlier. I would say ~~thxxx~~ that uh, that the primary difference is the ~~xxx~~ and sharing of the common, of a common objective, ~~xxx~~ a common arena of discourse Disagreement is based on the assumption that the institutions which make it possible for people to express their disagreement are worth preserving, and the frameworks, and this would vary from, under different circumstances. But that is the primary requirement for disagreement. Dissent would be acts which have the effect primarily of expressing one's separateness from others.

Now, there are many different ways in which that could be expressed. Now, when we come to the question of the consequences of the rise of ~~the~~ minorities, which you were just raising, I did not mean to suggest that the increase in minority consciousness had to be characterized as an evil. The minorities have been there, the question is how the members, all the members of our society can fulfill themselves more effectively. Now, obviously, one of the ways in which a person can fulfill himself is to discover something, as much as he can about himself. And this is, these are some of the great truths that Freud and others have led us to. But it doesn't follow that one can fulfill oneself by insisting on one's separateness. And I think that the challenge to us and the American community is to find ways of ~~ex~~ including, and providing ~~many~~ self-fulfillment for as many groups as we can who have felt separate.

UL:

I think we're dealing on a much too academic level here. I think we've got to uh we've got to talk in terms of what social programs are going on. You can talk about Negro history all you want, but if the Negroes still don't have decent schools and don't have decent places to live and don't have food to eat, then that all becomes rather superfluous, I should think, and I think we're talking about dissent, now, or demonstration, as a strategy or technique,

Firing Line episode 185 *Dissent and Society* transcript page 34 missing.

to know where you see this all going. What will we do?
We have what seems to me to be a crisis in education
And what's your answer? We know what the New Left thinks.

BO:

Well, I think you've gone to the heart of the matter.
And I think that we cannot expect our universities by
magic to make persons who have not received an adequate
elementary and secondary education into cultivated
liberally-educated persons. If you ask what my program
would be, I can give you a few suggestions. I think that
one of the, a very useful step would be to take large
numbers of our community colleges and make them into
more effective institutions of vocational training, to
provide people with skills so that they can take their
place in the community and be skilled members of the
society, in a society where technology, computer technology
and other skills are becoming increasingly important. So,
that you would, could in this way sidestep, or evade the
problem of the lack of qualifications of faculty

BU:

Thank you, Mr. Boorstin, thank you ladies and gentlemen,
gentlemen of the panel,

THEME

END OF TAPE