Liberalism a threat to U.S. free speech

About a year ago, an editorialist for the student newspaper at the University of Utah was politely critical of Jesse Jackson. He praised the reverend for his oratorical skills but expressed doubts about his stature

as a political leader.

For expressing these innocuous opinions the writer found himself under assault. A guest editorial (written by two law students) was printed in the school paper describing the columnist as a reactionary and a neo-Nazi, the writer was physically intimidated by "progressive" students, his car was vandalized. Perhaps most significantly, the writer — a young black man — was assaulted with racial epithets. For daring to express unsanctioned opinions, the writer was disparaged as an "Uncle Tom."

I review this year-old outrage in the hope that it will be a cautionary tale for graduating high school seniors. The attitudes manifest in this incident are not atypical of those that are found on many American

campuses.

Hell hath no fury to compare with that of an enraged pacifist; nobody is quite as intolerant as a paragon of liberal "openmindedness." Graduating seniors planning to leave Utah Valley to continue their studies should be advised that the most ominous threat to free speech and inquiry in American academia comes from the left.

The dominant faith in American academia remains liberalism. Contemporary liberalism is not a philosophy; philosophy requires thought. Rather, it is all impulse that produces vacuous rhetoric about "equality," "tolerance" and "sensitivity" and the need to find "common ground." Such nebulous language would be harmless but for the fact that it is used to disguise an appetite for power and a fierce intolerance for competing opinions.

A quarter of a century ago Hugh Nibley wrote about the "Liberal Paradox": "The Liberal is unpretentious and openminded ... yet he forms a jealously guarded clique for the exploitation of the general public, and distinguishes sharply between the intellectual class to which he belongs as a special elite and the layman, who is expected to support him and to seek instruction at his feet."

Today the "special elite" is



Will Grigg

FOR THE SAKE OF ARGUMENT

most likely to define itself in flattering contrast to "racist, sexist" American society.

Many American universities have devised regulations intended to extripate racism and sexism by punishing "inappropriate" speech and scholarship. For example, the University of Connecticut forbids the use of "derogatory names, inappropriately directed laughter, inconsiderate jokes, and conspicuous exclusion of another student from conversation."

The University of Pennsylvania will punish students for using language that "stigmatizes or victimizes individuals" or "creates an intimidating or offensive environment." Similar restrictions have been applied to in-

structors.

Of course, such restrictions are swaddled in idealistic language about the need to build a "better community" and to find "common ground." But they produce a confirmation of Karl Popper's "law of unintended consequences." Students cannot find common ground with members of other ethnic groups if they are tongue-tied with terror by the thought of giving offense.

A college education should be a rigorous apprenticeship in adulthood, something that liberalism — the politics of suspended adolescence — is singularly unequipped to provide. In the adult world it is necessary to distinguish between a mere annoyance and a genuine offense.

Restrictions on speech that cultivate exquisite sensitivity to every annoyance do students, particularly minority students, a great disservice. Teaching students to perceive every slight offense as a violation of one's rights helps produce a quarrelsome, litigious society — and helps create disgraceful incidents like the one involving the University of Utah columnist.

Perhaps it is too much to expect our tenured radicals to grow up. But is it too much to hope they could allow other generations the opportunity?