

unrestricted—is indispensable to freedom inside the classroom.

There is a phrase that Goethe used which can be translated approximately this way: "Man's talents can be developed in tranquility, his character in battling the world." As an integral part of this role is complete academic freedom, it must function to develop our talents according to the premise that truth is a greater virtue than comfort.

And that is why I say that along with the immunity from authority which we have and which we must have as citizens of a university we must be allowed to act freely as citizens in society battling the world and hopefully developing some measure of character. (applause)

Society cannot demand or specify exactly what a university shall provide, either in terms of leadership or in terms of the knowledge which we assume to be truths. Although society pays the price, and this has been emphasized to us this afternoon, it cannot and should not have any control over the product. (applause) It can assume, and properly, control over a university in only one respect, and this is that the university must always assume a role where intellectual commitment is foremost where the pursuit of new knowledge and criticism of old remains the pursuit of whatsoever things are true.

round five:

a free-for-all

Eli Mandel: I'd like to address my question to Professor Williamson. I speak without inspiration (applause) and in complete support of all the marvelous platitudes I've heard from the platform this afternoon. What I would like to ask you Mr. Williamson, is this: If you were a university president, what would you do with those irrational, inspired, irascible, unpredictable people like poets whom you might find on your faculty, particularly, let's say that you had those fascist poets William Butler Yeats and Ezra Pound on your faculty? (applause)

Williamson: I hope that I would not be included amongst those who uttered nothing but platitudes. (groan) As you surely remember I said to be inspired was a noble thing for man to be. I would make a very sharp distinction between what you call the inspiration of poets and the sort of inspiration which I have described. You will notice that I defined as precisely as possible in the time available what I meant by inspiration. I don't think that poetic activity falls into that category. If it did then I would regard what you say as a very serious criticism because I certainly have no intention of making what I said applicable to the poet's activities. But basically, I don't believe that it is at all.

Question: Sir, there is a medieval formula to the effect that the state should support the university in return for its criticism. You, Mr. Manning, are in obvious disagreement with this formula as evidenced by your attacks on intellectuals and statements by Socred MLA's which are clearly attempts to discredit a number of Alberta educators. Would you explain your attitudes on this matter, or if you will not explain them, will explain why you refuse to explain them? (applause)

Mr. Manning: Well, if I can remember all of the question, it seemed to me to be more of a statement than a question. (applause) In the first place I want to state most emphatically that I am not in any way critical of intellectualism I admire and respect it as much as any person in this room so let's not start any unfairness. (applause)

The other part of the question—the first part—I wonder if it could be repeated. I missed it, the sound wasn't too clear here, I wasn't quite sure what was said.

Question: The formula is this, sir. The state should support the university in return for its criticism.

Mr. Manning: Well, I have no quarrel whatever with criticism on the part of the university or anyone connected with it. We live in a country of freedom of free speech where anybody can criticize anything . . . as long as they stay within the laws of libel which the federal government has laid down. I have no quarrel with that, but I don't suggest for a moment, I don't think you would, that the only reason that the people of society should provide the means to provide and sustain a university is only for its criticism. Certainly the university can offer worthwhile criticism to the people connected with it. I think you'd have a hard time convincing society generally that that is the only

reason that society should support an university. I would say that that is one of the lesser reasons. (applause)

Prof. Williamson: Mr. Manning says that he is not opposed to intellectualism. Some of you may have suspected in the past that he was . . . (laughter) May I suggest that you have a close look at what is now by now a famous sermon delivered by Premier Manning on Dec. 6 of last year. A tape recording of the entire sermon is available apart from the bits that have already been published in Commonsense. In there you will find the expression "intellectual pervert" and you will find that intellectuals are said to be "idolrous and superstitious" amongst other things. (applause)

Mr. Manning: First of all, Mr. Moderator, I'd like to express my gratitude at knowing the Professor Williamson so faithfully listens to my radio broadcasts. (applause) If he by any chance loses that tape I have another that I'll gladly give him. But seriously, because time is brief, while I do not feel that the point raised has any connection with the subject of the panel, I think in fairness I should try to answer it. The particular talk that I gave

*"In my view, intellectualism . . . should be the highest goal and attainment in the educational field. I think that should be distinguished very carefully from what I would call, for lack of a better definition, pseudo-intellectualism."*

was merely one of a series. I was discussing the scriptural record of the time that the apostle Paul was debating with the Athenians on Mars Hill. And those of you here, I'm sure most of you are familiar with it, (laughter) and he said to the great philosophers of his day.

And I think the Athenian philosophers have some reputation as being pretty high up on the scale. That he perceived in all things they were too superstitious and he also went on to say a number of other things about them which suppose could be interpreted, and perhaps were interpreted at that time as complimentary. I recited these things word for word from his address and sought to make an application in our present day.

Now if that is bias against intellectualism—well that isn't my concept of bias.

There is one other part I would like to leave with you young people especially, and I tried say this to the public on many occasions because I think it is important from the standpoint of higher education in the university. In my view intellectualism, what I would define as the development of the mind to the absolute maximum degree possible, the ability of the person and the desire of the person to think for themselves and explore new areas of knowledge never previously explored. I think that should be the highest goal and attainment in the educational field. I think that should be distinguished very carefully from what I would, call for lack of a better definition, pseudo-intellectualism.

I call true intellectualism humility, a feeling that they have not begun to scratch the vast resources of knowledge that are still there. The pseudo-intellectual on the other hand is characterized by complete intolerance towards those whose religious or other philosophies he does not agree and a dogmatism in saying "I know

the answer I know what you have done." that is totally different to what I believe you find in the true intellectual. Anybody that says I'm opposed to intellectualism or that I have anything other than the greatest admiration for intellectualism, simply is not telling the truth. (applause)

Dr. Richard Baird: Will Prof. Williamson or anyone else on the panel mention some instances in which the government of Alberta has ever coerced this university staff to as what is thought and said? (applause)

Prof. Williamson: I think in fairness one of us should speak up. Anyone who pays the bills is in a rather strong position of being able to exert rather undefinable influence over the people that it employs.

Dr. Baird: Can anyone mention an instance in which anyone has been refused promotion or has been fired from this university though any coercive efforts of this government?

Mr. Mathews: I for one have. (applause) I want to make very clear to the members of the panel and to Professor Baird and to the members of the audience here that people who are moved by fear would have been moved, would have been moved in

be quarrelling with what members of the Legislature say, which in a very vague and indirect way is suggested might have some bearing on the university administration when this kind of statement is made by a member of this panel, a member of the university staff at a public meeting.

Mr. Williamson: May I say that I am as flattered by the fact that he keeps my tapes. (laughter) Mr. Manning, in regard to specifics and we are attempting to get down to them, we are now at the point of talking about coercion, and we are now, I think, also talking about the responsibilities of ministers to their electorate. One of the things that we have seen in this province, although not in regard to the university, but in regard to the high schools is the suspension of a high school teacher for taking an unpopular stand, (applause) the point being this: that according to the appropriate section of the School Act this suspension which was carried out, could have been carried out only for the reasons of mental infirmity. (laughter)

This was never the point at issue and the reason I bring it here now is because we are talking about the responsibility of members of your government, sir. Who, as members of your government, have all the coercive powers of this province behind them. And I would like you, sir, to reply to this specific problem.

Mr. Manning: Mr. Moderator, as I recall, the suspension in question was made by the local school authorities. A board of enquiry was set up to examine the complaint. The board recommended re-instatement and the minister himself personally wrote to the school authorities involved, urging the acceptance of the board's recommendation. Under the School Act the local authorities had the authority to accept or reject that recommendation. They chose to reject it. Now frankly I don't know where there's any legitimate room for criticism as far as the action of the minister of education is concerned, and again, I suggest maybe I'm wrong but this is very remote to the role of the university in community affairs.

Question: Coercion, or lack of it, or the opposite of it—encouragement—might take several forms and I would like to address my question to Mr. Manning and ask Mr. Thachuk if he will comment on Mr. Manning's answer. You, sir, mentioned a sense of responsibility and a measure of discipline as being prerequisites for maturity. Do these not lead to realistic priorities, and my question is this: If our priorities are realistic should not we in addition to building a Jubilee Auditorium encourage the Edmonton Symphony Orchestra more than we do, or to take another example if we have a large university hospital and are building a new medical science building should we not make available to medical research funds which neither the provincial government nor the federal government are doing at present as I understand it?

Mr. Manning: Well, Mr. Moderator this matter of priorities is really perhaps the deciding or major deciding factor in all governments in how far they go in supporting whether it's the symphony orchestra or whether it's medical research, whether it's in additional facilities for any of the matters mentioned. It's elementary to point out that in the work of government you are beset with requests from every segment of society for more public expenditures for different things.

Governments can only do their best to try and allocate the funds that are available among these innumerable needs in what seems to be the best and most desirable manner. Now certainly, there's room for disagreement. I can well understand that somebody would say it's better to give double the grant to the symphony orchestra than it is to give a grant as we did a few weeks ago to the national ski meet. The people in the skiing end of it of course say it's far more important to support the ski meet than it is the symphony, so these people do not agree. It becomes a matter of using your best judgment to try and make the most desirable allocations.

There's no one that's infallible. There's room for disagreement on these allocations. All we can do is the same as any other government—try to make, in the light of the total circumstances as they're brought to us from so many different sectors, what seems to be the most equitable allocations. (applause)

Thachuk: Well, personally, I think Mr. Manning's comments as to responsibility and self-discipline were meant to a very particular area. He was trying to circumscribe for us what should be the limits of public comments by university professors. I'm not at all connected with the

