



The Freedom and the Responsibility of Scholarship

It has become fashionable in some of our intellectual circles to fancy ourselves as members of a sort of guiding elite, especially entitled by our scholarly pursuits to speak out on every conceivable subject from "the admission of Red China to the United Nations" to the even more specialized and less savory topic that was suggested in your March editorial.

The editorial, of course, was directed against attempts at suppressing the freedom of scholars to express their views "as citizens." According to the *AAUP Bulletin* editorial, faculty members should have the right to identify their institutions with their expressions of view. And, furthermore: ". . . if they speak or write on subjects unrelated to their professional specialties, the public may benefit from knowing that they represent a profession with wisdom as a goal and criticism as an indispensable means."

Let us not speak of the embarrassment of institutions of learning or of the red faces of administrators of same. Let us certainly insist that the scholar is also a citizen.

But let us also suggest that these particular citizens have certain special responsibilities as scholars. Let us propose that they have responsibilities to the world of scholarship as well as to the world of citizens.

Should I, a political scientist with a specialty in Latin American affairs, pretend to speak with authority regarding English literature? Though I may be quite ignorant about zoology, is the public supposed to accord me a special respect when I discourse on the love life of the laughing hyena? Am I to use my institutional affilia-

tions and academic titles to help persuade the public to some uninformed view about microbiology? Or medicine? Or telecommunications? Or physics?

Speaking of physics, I hope that certain scientists will not be influenced by your editorial. By proffering advice in the realms of international relations in general, and particularly in affairs which relate to delicate matters of diplomacy and peace, they have done the world quite enough damage already.

Is it proposed that I, a political scientist, am authorized to throw my scholarly weight around in favor of one party or the other, or to seem to the public to put my institution on one side or the other of political issues about which even my colleagues are far from agreed?

On the great questions of knowledge about which the specialists in our respective fields are substantially of the same view, and in which we are able to disseminate what seems to be truth, I would insist that we have a heavy responsibility to advise the public. I would also join with the *AAUP* editors and with Committee A in insisting that no one, scholar or otherwise, should be legally barred from opening his silly mouth almost whenever and however he feels like it. But I would surely hope that the *AAUP Bulletin* would join with many of us in bringing down the full weight of the scholarly world upon those who misuse the badge of their intellectualism to create public favor for their own prejudiced views in realms about which they have no more authority to speak than does any honest butcher, baker, or candle-stick maker.

The purposes of scholarship are to search for knowledge and to disseminate learning. It is precisely the responsibility of the scholar to confine his public utterances, as scholar, to those questions about which he can speak with the authority of special knowledge.

It is not out of any awe for the governors of institutions, but out of awe for the great functions and purposes of scholarship, that one must make clear that he speaks as citizen when performing the functions of his citizenship; and that one must speak, and loudly, as a scholar only when he knows what he is talking about.

JAMES L. BUSEY
(Political Science)
University of Colorado

Increasing the Effectiveness of Censure

Whenever a Committee A investigating report is published in the *AAUP Bulletin*, enough reprints should be run off so that one can be sent to each living alumnus and trustee of the institution.

This is almost the only way by which this large constituency of the institution can properly be informed as to the facts and can be alerted to protest and apply the tremendous pressure which alumni have. As matters now stand, some alumni occasionally hear of what is going on in miscellaneous haphazard ways. But all alumni need to have not only the original published report of Committee A but also the continuing annual reports on negotiations carried on after an administration has been censured.

When fund-raising activities are cur-