feedback separate

To the Editor:

Now that Ronald Reagan has won, liberal intellectuals are running true to form and predicting that sanity national disasters are about to befal "Reagan will get us into World War III," "the next few years will be calamitous for women," "Reagan will preserve the dominance of the moneyed elite," etc. The amount of disaster that is expressed is inversely proportional to the degree to which the disputed has kept an open mind over the years on political and social issues. Show the somewhat rendered near-hysterical by the general election and I'll show you someone who has superficially avoided coming into contact with the conservative viewpoint. Show me someone rendered delirious by it and I'll show you someone who has carefully shunned the liberal viewpoint.

Intellectuals like to think of themselves as a breed apart from ordinary people. They believe that their abilities of our predecessors are on that jury. I'm glad for the defendant that they eventually did. A half a day. When his dissenting vote was cast, the other amount of deliberation. When his weapon. Eleven jurors voted immediately for conviction. One did not, not because he believed that the defendant was innocent, but excellent motive; his alibi is- trivial reflections of the world at large by deciding to raise this is true, that intellectuals are open-minded, then every book publisher or magazine editor might be interested in your work. But, no, you have to send it to someone predisposed to agree with you because editors, as complements intellectuals, are doubly afraid of the recklessness of their positions that openness-mindedness entails. How many intellectuals, to form an opinion on a specific issue, read what is written about it in The New Republic and The Nation, on the one side, and The National Review and Commentary on the other? I don't know of a single one. Lectures, with few exceptions, are attended by people secure in the knowledge that they are going to be told what they already believe. Conservatives go to talks given by conservatives; liberals by liberals; radicals by radicals. They think that their attention is motivated by the innocent desire to be educated. The real reason they go is to memorize the arguments their hero(ine) will express so that they can use them tomorrow against the stubborn guy across the hall, the obstinate neighbor next door, the pigheaded chap in the office.

A popular film of about twenty years ago was entitled Twelve Angry Men. As the picture begins a dozen jurors are seen filing into a juryroom to decide the fate of a hot-tempered teenager accused of murdering his father. The defendant's case appears hopeless. For killing his father he had an excellent motive; his alibi is shaky. He was observed near the scene of the crime around the time it happened. His fingerprints were discovered on the murder weapon. Even jurors voted immediately for conviction. One did not, not because he believed that the defendant was innocent, but because he felt that so grave a matter demanded a reasonable amount of deliberation. When his casting vote was cast by the other jurors were so outraged as to nearly lynch him. But deliberate they eventually did. A half a day later, they filed back into the jury room and declared a verdict of not guilty. I'm glad for the defendant that that is not the verdict of any of my intellectual friends were on that jury.

Roger Kolb

Improve human relations

(Continued from page 4)