

Prof. Herrnstein's decision to cancel his appearance here has ended by sullyng most of the participants in the affair, including Herrnstein himself.

By never issuing a public statement guaranteeing (as far as is possible in a public lecture) Herrnstein's right to speak without fear of duress or coercion, the university has been overly lax in its duty to respond quickly and firmly to any anticipated threat to academic freedom.

The University Action Group (UAG), by plastering campus walls with simplistic, inflammatory posters announcing 'Racist Professor chased out of Iowa' has encouraged the development of a feeling of confrontation, not of intellectual disagreement. It is true that UAG decided to let Herrnstein speak his fill on pigeons. It is also true that the UAG said it would not let him leave if he refused to answer questions on racism afterwards — which is certainly threatening.

And Herrnstein himself, in refusing to come here, has reneged on an implicit academic responsibility to openly discuss his controversial work. However important the study on pigeons, his article in *Atlantic*, by focusing national attention on an extremely tender and important subject, has given him the responsibility as author and proponent to answer questions and debate problems with those seriously interested in I.Q. theory. Refusing to speak because of a few placards is a clear evasion of that responsibility. That Herrnstein bowed in a somewhat cowardly fashion to what he perceived as bullying is equally important. A refusal to stand up to threats, whether real or imaginary, only hurts the university by establishing that pressure tactics will sometimes succeed in keeping people quiet.

Oddly enough, all of these unfortunate actions nonetheless combined in such a way as to resolve any potential crisis. Herrnstein is not coming and we will never know if there would have been a confrontation. It would be absurd to rely on such a "fortunate" occurrence in the future, however.

There is one rather bizarre aspect to all this which throws the fundamental principles involved into some relief. In much of the UAG literature there are recurring references to Nazi Germany, linking Herrnstein by implication to the racist policies of the Third Reich. In some of the responses to the UAG, there are also references to Nazi Germany, this time to book burning and intellectual persecution. Ironically such rhetorical tactics from the two sides of the controversy serve to weaken both a foundation of academic freedom — opposing ideas only with other ideas not with force — and a responsibility of academic freedom, which is to actually participate in such dialogue.

Oppose the tax

While students have repeatedly asked the university to let them out of mandatory Commons contracts, the most recent plan to allow approximately 150 sophomores to make their own dining arrangements at the cost of a \$15 room charge is inequitable.

Ideally, of course, students should not be forced to eat at Commons. Herding freshmen and sophomores into separate facilities from upperclassmen only perpetuates the social chasm between underclassmen and juniors and seniors. Furthermore, it is testimony that Commons food is not good enough to attract "customers."

The proposal to let some sophomores out of Commons does not, however, solve this problem to any substantial extent, and increases the financial burden on both the rest of the student body and on the university. Most of the private eating clubs have declined to open their doors to the sophomores in any case. The upshot is that all students would have to pay for a somewhat dubious privilege limited to under five per cent of the student body. In addition to this, students living off campus would be exempt since the cost would be appended to dormitory charges.

Students should vote to defeat the \$15 room fee proposal in today's referendum.

The DAILY PRINCETONIAN

DAVID S. ELKIND '73, *Chairman*
RICHARD WINSTON THALER JR. '73, *Business Manager*

ASSISTANT BUSINESS EDITORS

Kenneth P. Brier '75	Robert A. Gustafson '75
Bebe Crosby '75	Mary P. Hurley '75
Shantayanan Devarajan '75	Alexander M. Jones '75
Gladys J. Epting '75	Jeffrey M. Oakes '75
Robert S. Fairweather '75	Marc L. Oberdorff '75
Michael B. Purvis '75	

Night Editors: NORTH — TONELSON — WILHEIM —
SEROTA — MARTIN — HURLEY

Published five times per week, Monday through Friday during the college year, except during examination and reading periods three times per week, Monday, Wednesday and Friday by THE DAILY PRINCETONIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY INC., 48 University Place, Princeton, New Jersey 08540. Second-Class postage paid at Princeton, New Jersey. Subscription rates: Undergraduates and graduate students on campus, \$16.00 a year, 9.00 a term; University Offices and Faculty Apartments, \$18.50 a year, \$10.00 a term; Mail in the U.S., \$18.50 a year, \$10.00 a term. Foreign and Quantity Rates available on request. Telephones: Area Code 609. Business: 924-1858; News and Editorial: 921-9200. If no answer call 452-3633. Reproduction of any material in this paper without the express permission of THE DAILY PRINCETONIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY INC., is strictly prohibited. Copyright 1972, THE DAILY PRINCETONIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC.

'You cannot kill an idea by force'

To the Chairman:

I should like to make clear that the cancellation of Professor Herrnstein's scheduled colloquium poses questions of fundamental significance. This unhappy episode cannot be ignored by anyone who cares about universities and their purposes.

Professor Herrnstein was recently prevented from speaking at the University of Iowa by a demonstration. He felt that he had reason to suppose that the same thing might happen at Princeton. I assume that our university administration would have taken every reasonable measure to protect his right to speak here, but Professor Herrnstein chose not to risk exposing himself to the verbal and physical violence which he encountered at Iowa, and which he anticipated might occur here. This outcome can only be viewed as a victory for those forces which presume to tell us whom we may listen to, speaking on what subjects, and under what circumstances. That is not the way of a university; that can lead only to the death of universities.

It seems to me essential to separate the content, and the presumed consequences, of a man's work from people's right to listen to him speak. Professor Herrnstein's celebrated article on I.Q. seems to me wrong both in its premises and in its argument; and I am concerned about the social consequences clearly implied by what I take to be his erroneous views. There are appropriate ways to combat the propagation of error, the most effective of which is the propagation of truth. Neither I, nor other members of our department, have been remiss in our efforts to clarify the issues involved in the study of the heritability of intelligence. I do not view the threat of violence against a speaker as effective either in clarifying an issue, or in

undoing the harmful consequences of an erroneous view. The point has been made before; you cannot kill an idea — not even a very bad one — by force. Those who think you can have no understanding either of a university, or of how to build a good society.

I hope and believe that the overwhelming majority of the members of the Princeton University community understands this issue clearly, and will not be remiss in expressing their views. If not, we might as well close up shop.

LEON J. KAMIN
Chairman, Department
of Psychology

'Misconceptions'

To the Chairman:

Certain misconceptions have been created by recent articles in the 'Prince' about the reasons behind our sponsorship of a referendum on the UGA \$1 tax and the sophomore release plan. We applaud the recent action taken by David Jones and the UGA to cover UGA administrative costs for next year by taking them from the "overall UGA activities assessment," but this does nothing about the money which was taken this year in a fashion smacking of legislative legerdemain. This money was appropriated before the UGA voted on it. It must be returned.

With regard to the sophomore-release plan, we applaud the UGA's 29-7 approval of the program, but we cannot help but ask what effect it had, seeing how the Trustees had already accepted it themselves? Last Friday's 'Prince' featured remarks which discredited our disclosure of a "confidential report" concerning the impact of the release plan because of "inadvertant inaccuracies" concerning financial costs. If one rereads our "Opinion" which appeared in the 'Prince' on February 28, 1972, he will dis-

cover that our use of the report made no mention of any financial figures whatsoever. Our objection is that this report, used by the Priorities Committee, evidenced certain assumptions which were never answered. In particular, we cite the belief that students would be willing to pay for this program. The referendum will give students a chance to answer the question themselves.

In conclusion, we do not oppose sophomore release, but we feel that this particular program has resulted from insufficient student participation. The benefits have not been spelled out to the campus beyond the general platitudes that Commons produces "strains" and "ill-will!" A "yes" vote for our resolution will mean no sophomore release for next year, but it will not obviate the possibility of a future program which may be more equitable and result from greater student participation.

STEVEN L. GLAUBERMAN '73
CHARLES E. M. KOLB '73
GARY A. ULMER '73

Dialogue in Academia

To the Chairman:

We do not think it fair that Mr. Runyeon's parody of USA's recent "white paper" be called "puerile." It was a clever work, and demonstrated the old maxim that one of the best ways to react to something you don't understand is to laugh at it.

Clearly, Mr. Runyeon did not understand what USA was trying to accomplish with this series of papers. It was our hope that just that sort of dialogue we all consider important in an "academic" community would be provoked by these papers.

Sometimes polemics are necessary in a community like Princeton where so many people (faculty and students) tend to think that certain "community truths" need never be challenged. Our

(Continued on page three)

OPINION

Release sophomores from Commons

By MARTIN D. FRANKS

The sponsors of today's referendum on the Sophomore-Release Plan ask if the plan's benefits justify charging all undergraduates \$15 to pay for the program. The answer is clearly YES.

The benefits to this year's and subsequent freshman classes are obvious since they may be released from mandatory university meal contracts. The problem lies in the current sophomore and junior classes who are beyond the point of the plan's immediate impact. Should they be taxed under those circumstances?

Actually, situations in which everyone pays for programs or facilities which do not immediately involve or directly benefit everyone are commonplace within the University. Female undergraduates are required to pay for the maintenance of Caldwell Field House, not all students use the computer center, and only 120 undergraduates study in the Woodrow Wilson School. It is consensus opinion, however, that these programs and facilities make this a better university. The Sophomore-Release Plan has the same potential.

Happily, the plan can draw upon other arguments: It is a pilot plan to determine whether or not total release is financially feasible and socially desirable. If release proves advantageous, upperclassmen will indeed benefit. Those in residential colleges will have a sophomore membership truly

interested in the life of the college rather than a group just "taking up space" because they must have a meal contract. Those on Prospect Street will see a larger pool of potential members; many clubs are interested in sophomore membership.

One further note of explanation is necessary. The referendum's sponsors have raised objections to the manner in which the Sophomore-Release Plan was effected. Contrary to their contention, the UGA was consulted. On December 9th, I reported to the UGA that if any sophomores were released, everyone would pay the ensuing cost. There was not significant dispute of the point. The exact plan was not presented to the UGA before trustee approval because the UGA did not meet in time to consider it before action had to be taken. When I did take the plan to the assembly, it passed overwhelmingly, 29-7. The Central Dormitory Council was not consulted because I was and still am of the opinion that the issue is not within the province of that body. To call the plan's history one of "ineptness" is rash at best. The Undergraduate Life Committee studied the problem exhaustively with scrupulous regard for student concerns. The Plan was fostered by students, presented to the Trustees by students, and it benefits students.

Support the Plan.

Vote "NO" on Proposal II.