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For the teacher, particularly in the field of history and the social studies, it has been an interesting observation to see how certain ideas, held only by a minority a few years back, have come to be generally accepted, and to observe how he himself perhaps has shifted in his point of view on social issues.

The very possibility, and probability, of this occurring, if one is not entirely blind to new light on problems and environmental factors, tends to make the scholar tolerant toward those who dare to stand out from the crowd in the first place as dissenters against what they judge to be a threat to the general good. At the time of their dissent we let them register their opposition in lonely solitude, being anxious as most of us are not to be obtrusive or obnoxious and to get along with the majority, only to find ourselves later possibly embracing the very ideas for which our lonely dissenters were anathematized.

Dissent is an indispensable ingredient in a democratic society. Our British cousins have respect for the role of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, and it would be nothing short of disastrous were we Americans to minimize the importance of a strong two party system, wherein the party in office is subjected to close scrutiny by a political opposition.
Though this presentation is concerned largely with the dissent of liberalism and what has been termed utopianism, the need for a healthy balance between property and human rights is essential. If society is not to become chaotic, certain conservative checks must be maintained which will conserve what is best of the past while adaptations are made to meet changing needs. From the days of Periclean Athens to the United States of America, the need for some degree of restraint upon the will of the people as a whole by the conservative forces of the state has been demonstrated. Certainly one of the elements of strength in the success of the Constitution of the United States is its system of checks and balances, which has aided this nation in avoiding excesses of democratic impulse, such as occurred in the Athenian democracy after the conservative Areopagus was stripped of political power.

My hope this morning is that we might gain a little better perspective or understanding of the significance of the role played by the dissenter in society. Every generation has its seers or dreamers who prophetically look ahead of their own time to a better and more equitable social order. Emerson expressed the basic urge of this class when he said that man is born to be a reformer. Motivated by a kind of inspired discontent, these welcome whatever social change is necessary to meet the needs of their own and subsequent generations. Life and society are in constant flux, whereas the institutions of our social order tend to become stationary and encrusted with unsocial and possibly even anti-social elements. Because these institutions do not adapt promptly and
in step with constantly changing needs of humanity, we have the problem of a time lag, for example, between industrial change and political adjustment. Laws and institutions once quite adequate, may no longer meet the needs of a new day. Thus recurring crises of collective dissatisfaction are a feature of the continually shifting forces of our civilization.

This condition of inequity provides a battle ground for the liberal, or progressive as he may be called, in American history, to attack entrenched privilege. Every student of American history recalls the struggle to secure desperately needed social legislation, such as workmen's compensation, protection for women in industry, child labor laws, only to have them invalidated at first as being in trespass upon recognized property rights. But the American progressive persisted and refused to acquiesce tamely in a fatalism which would bind man to a predestined economic condition. Economic laws were not immutable to these dissenters. Man was not a helpless victim doomed to a bare subsistence by some iron law of wages, nor would they accept the 'divine right dictum of the mine operators in a noted strike early in this century, that the interests of the workers should be left, as they put it, not to 'labor agitators' but to the Christian men to whom God in His infinite wisdom has given the control of the property interests of the country.

This group of look aheaders, who insist in pointing out to us the wide gap between present reality and future possibility, are often
greeted with sneers and jeers and derided as impractical visionaries, heretics, radicals, people of diseased mentality. The jibe of Macaulay illustrates this disparaging attitude—that he would prefer an acre in Middlesex to a whole principality in Utopia. The men who painstakingly investigated the Teapot Dome scandals of the Harding administration were rewarded for their services with venomous accusations and denounced as "assassins of character." It would seem that these critics of their age are destined to ridicule from their contemporaries of lesser perception, for holding ideas disturbing to the status quo, and which society some day, in the march of events, may overtake.

Moreover, this class may include men of originality, creativeness, and imagination. The very element of originality suggests the rather rough, unpolished, and even unconventional behavior of many of these which has in itself tended to offend the sensibilities of their contemporaries. One need only to mention such names as that ugly gadfly of Athens, Socrates, or Henry Thoreau, Walt Whitman, Thorstein Veblen, or in our own time that man described as the most unloved figure in the eyes of America's educational administrators, Admiral Rickover.

In any consideration of dissent, a distinction must be made between the courageous visionary, dedicated to the welfare of humankind, as opposed to the dissent which is born of an unbalanced mind, spawning its myriads of crackpots, and unscrupulous demagogues skilled in the practice of innuendo and the smear. It is lamentable that in some cases these dangerous fomentors of social discord are motivated by misguided idealism
and a false sense of mission. Somewhere they have lost their perspective, inflicting greater harm on society than the evil they seek to eradicate. Much as we admire the dignity with which John Brown faced his martyrdom, the fact remains that he was guilty of heinous crime. And in our own day we simply cannot condone the rantings of the John Birchites, who in their indiscriminate attack of the enemy, without and within, would undermine the very foundations of freedom and the privilege of dissent.

It is in our relations with this extremist fringe that we find our adherence to the principle of dissent most sorely tested. It comes down to this that we must be tolerant so far as possible with the intolerant. This is not easy, but even the misguided hate-spreaders, have rights which society must protect—if we wish our rights protected. This does not mean that society cannot deal with these people when their actions become criminal and an overt danger to the state. Even at the point where punishment is being meted out for crime, moderation is more sensible than vengeance. How much better it would have been for Governor Wise of Virginia to have lived up to his name and committed John Brown to a mental asylum, where he properly belonged, than to have made him a martyr on the gallows.

Admittedly the dissenter or utopian has often had serious limitations of outlook, many times spinning his ideas out of theory alone, without an adequate understanding of the physical or economic bases of society. Very often he has made the error of oversimplifying the causes of society's ills. Some have assumed too trustingly that history was on
their side and that progress in society was foreordained. Many have erected beautiful social edifices on the false foundation of the perfectibility of human nature. Rousseau stated that man was originally perfect but corrupted by environment; however more than one reformer, including Robert Owen, found in the pathetic crash of his utopian community that to simply modify the environment did not guarantee that men would act as angels. They discovered moreover that human nature resists such structures as communal sharing of all property and family life. Life is a constant struggle and always will be; to attempt to eliminate all struggle is naive and based on an incorrect understanding of human nature this side of the millennium.

Yet, with all their shortcomings, the social idealists perform an immeasurable service to their day. In this twentieth century of scientific and physical miracle, we should be less willing to admit that the improbable dreams of yesterday are impossible of reality. Our dreaming may not be so far-fetched in the long run of history.

Furthermore the cause of progressivism needs its visionaries and utopian dreamers, as much as it needs machinery for reform. It requires its thinkers and theorists as much as its practical politicians. And even if an ideal were never to be realized, there may be sound value in the very ideal itself. Man is moved by what he imagines, as well as by what he can see and touch. If the criterion for measuring the usefulness of the visionary or utopian to society is based purely on immediate, tangible results, such as a political or legislative victory, then the
visionary may well be written off as supernumerary. But in the long run struggle for principle and moral standards, what appears to be present defeat may turn out to be pure gain.

The very vision of these seers helps to loosen the dead hand of the past upon our day; it encourages the groping for new solutions and the social experimentation necessary to overcome stagnation. This is particularly true in times of national economic and political crises.

The past is replete with instances of dreamers whose visions have materialized for the betterment of mankind. This generation of ours needs to be reminded of the dramatic eradication of slavery in country after country in the nineteenth century—an age old dream of centuries of reformers. With all of their limitations, who can deny the influence of such English utopians as Sir Thomas More of the sixteenth century and Robert Owen, three hundred years later, in inspiring reform in the fields of education, penology, cooperatives, and labor legislation? James Harrington of Cromwell's time, wrote Oceana, the most popular utopia of his day, in which he attempted to set forth the basic principles of the constitution of an ideal state. This work so deeply influenced John Adams in his draft of the constitution of Massachusetts that one delegate, facetiously or otherwise, proposed that the name of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts be changed to Oceana. The influence of this utopia is to be seen also in the constitutions of other states, and in that of the United States itself.

Seventy-five years ago Edward Bellamy published his utopian romance,
Looking Backward, in which he pictured the perfect society as he envisioned it in 2000 A.D. Selling over a million copies, this novel made a tremendous impact upon the liberal thought of his time. It gave birth to the Nationalist movement, which influenced the significant Populist Party of the late nineteenth century, which again in turn, made a strong impression upon the William Jennings Bryan wing to the Democratic Party.

Thorstein Veblen was a professional economist and brilliant Ph.D., who gained little recognition while living, partly because of personal traits offensive to his contemporaries, but whose virus affected a handful of discerning scholars, who recognized in such works as The Theory of the Leisure Class, "satire unique in scholarship and originality." Choosing the prosaic academic monograph to express himself, this man was unsparing in his indictment of what he considered antiquated or ancestral habits of thought which barred progress so sorely needed in sectors of the society of his time. Today no serious study of the period can ignore the contribution of this dissenter.

That highly controversial literary figure, Walt Whitman, apart from his break with the conventional in his themes and in his poetic style, beat a veritable gong of revolt in his Leaves of Grass. "I am a radical of radicals," he once put it, in his passionate dissent against the injustices of the shoddy society of his day. In his Leaves of Grass he drew a memorable picture of the Great City—his democratic commonwealth of the future—but for the moment this was only a so-called dream, cruelly mocked and nullified by the sordid operations of the Drews, Fisks,
and Goulds of the Gilded Age of our American life. His crudities may be forgotten in time; certainly his passion and aspiration for America will continue to live on.

Henry George, appalled at the great paradox of his society—that as his country made phenomenal strides in technological and economic progress, the problem of poverty was becoming more and more desperate. Something clearly was wrong. Rather than raising the level of all living standards to a respectable decency, our advances in industry, our amassing of wealth—all seemed to be widening the gap between rich and poor. This ought not to be, and thus in his masterpiece, *Progress and Poverty*, a kind of prose-poem, Henry George sought to arouse the conscience of his generation. With the perspective gained in the eighty-three years since the publication of this work, we can quickly dismiss his proposal of the single-tax; however the fervor of his writing has continued for over three quarters of a century to inspire men to cope with inequity in society, to the end that America may be democratic in fact as well as in profession.

And, if time allowed, this array of pioneering dissenters, ridiculed first but later honored, could be lengthened to include the Henry Demarest Lloyds and Ida Tarbells who dared to write their fact-studded essays of exposures of the "industrial statesman" of their day, who also played the dual role of "robber barons"; of the Horace Manns and Henry Barnards who dedicated their lives to the reform of public education, only to be denounced as purveyors of "socialized" education, of the frail Dorothea
Dixes whose hearts were touched by the calloused treatment of the prisoner and the insane, of the Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Stanton's who were willing to accept the derision of their contemporaries for their wildly radical insistence "that all men and women are created equal;" of the Jane Addamses who attacked the evils of the slum through the establishment of settlement houses; of the Peter Altgelds who had the integrity to risk political suicide, rather than to incarcerate anarchists, against whom no overt criminal act was proven; and of the many other dissenters against the injustices of an ingrown status quo, who were by no means infallible, whose idealism in some cases was misguided—but who, in a society which had forgotten its own revolutionary beginnings and had subordinated everything to the material level of profits, kept alive a spirit of equality and community welfare.

Our debt to these prophets of dissent, in warning us against the dangers of a blind adherence to the past, can never be overstated. At home, as well as abroad, we Americans in our diplomacy and in our missionary effort have found ourselves too frequently identified with an outdated economic, social, and political order on the part of people crying for change in this changing world. Confronted by the most threatening ideological challenge in our history, we must be more alert to the dynamism and revolutionary character of our own society. As Americans we deny the charge that we are a reactionary, decadent, capitalistic society which has passed its hey-day and is now merely attempting to maintain a precarious defense of the status-quos. Rather, we will
point out as President Kennedy did to Premier Khruschev that the United States itself had its beginnings in that bad word, Revolution; we assert that we do not need foreign brands of radicalism; that we have our own tradition of dissent and progressivism which, through the years, has provided us with an indigenous radicalism in harmony with our own American experience.

Likewise to the pseudo super patriots, who today inflict our society with their mouthings of Americanism—who would identify all dissent with Communism or Socialism—we contend that a stand against privilege and monopoly is characteristically American; that in our mixed economy in the United States, some elements of our system necessarily require social planning and that some forms of socialism are not incompatible with democracy; that all class bitterness in our life cannot be blamed on foreign agitators; that the way to meet the challenge of our time is to make democratic society function for the benefit of all, and not to deny its citizens the underlying freedoms of a free society.

President Kennedy has wisely warned the nation against an irrational hysteria which extremist groups would foist upon us. More specifically another spokesman for the administration has cautioned the American people against the ultras who 'under the banner of patriotism' and 'with the excuse of combating Communism' are opposing dissent as being unpatriotic. These ultras, to some degree or other, he has said would 'spy upon their neighbors, impeach the judiciary, support the intrusion of politics into the military, abandon the United Nations, 'impose upon
the land styling uniformity falsely labelled as loyalty', deny dissent and 'impose patriotism from above by executive fiat'.

America has never idolized its dissenters--somehow they have never appealed to the legend makers. Nevertheless these disturbers of complacency deserve a niche in our American heritage along with statesmen, military leaders, gridiron heroes, and our titans of industry and finance. As intelligent American citizens may we ever preserve the precious right of honest dissent!
CONTEMPORARY POLITICAL CONSERVATISM IN AMERICA

Address to the Seattle Pacific College Student Body by
Professor F. Wesley Walls
Department of Political Science

Conservatism is being debated extensively across America today, but discussions are frequently held without definition of terms or historical context. The presentation today is designed to enable you college students to think of political conservatism within a historical framework dominated by the work of Edmund Burke.

I encourage you to read some recent books on conservatism. You should read *Conservatism* by Peter Viereck, *The Conservative Mind* by Russell Kirk, *Conservatism in America* by Clinton Rossiter, and *The Case for Conservatism*, by Francis Wilson. There are many other good books which have been published recently, but your understanding will be advanced most by developing an awareness first of the life and work of Edmund Burke. This man is recognized as the father of philosophical political conservatism. The birth of conservatism is dated by the publication by Burke in 1750 of his *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. I trust that this talk today will encourage you to undertake an acquaintance with Burke.

Conservatism has recently become fashionable again, and liberalism has declined in popular acceptance. A recent Gallop Poll reported that more American citizens considered themselves as conservatives than liberals. I do not have data on the same question for preceding years but I suspect that this is the first time for several decades that more people
consider themselves conservatives than liberals.

A number of scholars have noted the decline of liberalism and the emergence of conservatism. Alan P. Grimes stated recently, "Liberalism in America has been at a low ebb since the Second World War." Carey McWilliams maintains that the political left has disappeared from our politics leaving only a greatly expanded middle and a swollen right. He said, "Half of the political spectrum has vanished; it simply isn't there." Walter Lippman stated, following the last general election:

The selection of Dillon as Secretary of Treasury confirms the view...that in general economic philosophy there is no serious difference between Kennedy and such progressive Republicans as Governor Rockefeller and Vice President Nixon...The truth is that Kennedy is a conservative of the age we live in.

These statements must be very confusing to students who take literally the charges of the Republicans that the Democrats are liberals and the counter-charges of the Democrats that the Republicans are conservatives. The reciprocal charges do have some validity within the narrow range of policy versus policy, but the facts are that they have relatively little validity within the context of political ideology versus political ideology. The relatively minor changes which occurred in government during the administrations of Truman, Eisenhower, and of Kennedy thus far is illustrative of the fact that the two parties hold essentially the same view of the contemporary role of government. In this talk then, we will be concerned primarily with the political ideology which underlies the programs of both major American political parties.
I think you are entitled to inquire whether I have any purpose other than to describe conservatism. The answer is that I do. I am interested that the term "Conservatism" should not be improperly used. Since the term became respectable again, individuals and groups have used the label for their own interests. I should like for you as informed citizens to be able to determine when the term is properly used and avoid its misuse.

In recent decades programs have been presented to the American people as Liberal whereas in reality they were radical. The people were misled. Now the danger is that programs are being presented to the American people as Conservative whereas in reality they are reactionary. The people are being misled again. The strength of a democracy depends in large measure upon the ability of the citizens to assess properly the nature of programs that are offered. As college students you should be able to analyze them accurately.

My discussion of Conservatism will have two parts. The first will be a general description of a conservative. The second will outline the major tenets of conservatism.

A conservative defies exact description. When we speak of a conservative, we are speaking of a particular mood, a faith, a way of life, a temperament which applies not only to politics but usually to other aspects of life as well. The conservative temperament as described by Burke and reflected in him may be characterized as wary of human nature, of reason and of human ability. There is a dislike of abstract theories, experimentation and Utopian claims. On the contrary, the conservative
temperament prefers to stay with things as they appear to be; there is a tendency to resist change because experience seems to be a better guide than \textit{a priori} formulations. Basic to these characteristics is a very real fear of "rootlessness". Burke illustrated the conservative temperament in his assertion that "rage and frenzy will pull down more in half an hour than prudence, deliberation and foresight can build up in one hundred years."

Because conservatism flows from a living temperament there are nearly as many variations of conservatism as there are conservative statesmen and thinkers. For the sake of clarity here we will outline three positions. In the middle is the Burkean type, the moderate, the evolutionary. This is the type of conservatism with which this talk is concerned. On the extreme right is the reactionary, counter-evolutionary, the authoritarian. On the left the moderate conservative begins to blend into the characteristics of the liberal. The temperament of the liberal is optimistic rather than wary; there is a tendency to innovate rather than to develop, there is a reliance upon reason rather than feelings. It is true that there is no exactly precise line which can be drawn between a conservative and a liberal, but an understanding of the two different temperaments is helpful in distinguishing between them. This view is supported by Clinton Rossiter, a contemporary American conservative, who observed that:

The essential difference between conservatism and liberalism is one of mood and bias. No line separates one camp from the other, but somewhere between them stands a man who is at once the most liberal of conservatives and most conservative of liberals.
Personally I admire that man who stands in the middle because he would be able to recognize the strengths of conservatism and also its weaknesses; likewise he would appreciate the assets of liberalism and its liabilities as well.

We now proceed from our general description of a conservative to an outline of the major tenets of conservatism.

A first major tenet is the religious basis of society.

Someone has said that the mortar that holds together the mosaic of conservatism is religious feeling. The writings of Edmund Burke led Russel Kirk to observe that the first cannon of conservative thought is the "belief that a divine intent rules society..." An official statement of the British Conservative Party referred to the tenet in this fashion:

Man is a spiritual creature adventuring on an immortal destiny, and science, politics, or economics are good or bad so far as they help or hinder the individual soul on its eternal journey. This is an age of change--but there are unchanging truths, and in such times as ours, it is above all things necessary to keep this before our eyes.

Quentin Hogg stated that he is convinced that "There can be no genuine conservatism which is not founded upon a religious view of the basis of civil obligation..."

Earlier conservatives stated their belief that above all there is a moral order with which life as well as government should align itself, and to which the individual, including the politician, is accountable. Burke said:

All persons possessing any portion of power ought to be
strongly and awfully impressed with an idea that they act
in trust; and that they are to account for their conduct
in that trust to the one great Master, author and founder
of Society.

When there is a belief that a divine intent rules society the in-
dividual holding such a belief tends to be cautious in several respects.
He concedes that his own ideas can be influenced by the divine intent and
thus does not rely overly on his own individual reason as a basis for in-
itiating and conducting programs. Again, in the administration of pro-
grams, he is concerned that government should operate in harmony with
the divine intent. This is not to say that the conservative is a vision-
ary, but rather that there is a tendency to look beyond himself for
wisdom. Perhaps it would be accurate to say that the conservative, as
opposed to the liberal, is less likely to rely on human reason as con-
clusive.

A second tenet of conservatism concerns the nature of man.

The conservative holds that man is a composite of good and evil.
He is a blend of excellencies and imperfections. It is true that if
man is carefully educated and placed in a favorable environment and held
by the restraints of tradition and authority that he will display
qualities of rationality, sociability, industry and decency. However,
man will never be able to throw off all the tendencies arising from
his nature and restraint are needed.

This view of man tends to place the source of man's maladjustments
and discontents in defective human nature rather than in a defective
social order. Clinton Rossiter has pointed out the implications this view of humanity has for government when he said:

No truth about human nature and capabilities is more important than this; man can govern himself, but there is no certainty that he will. Free government is possible but far from inevitable. Man will need all the help he can get from education, religion, tradition, and institutions if he is to enjoy even a limited success in his experiments in self-government. He must be counseled, encouraged, informed, and checked. Above all, he must realize that the collective wisdom of the community, itself the union of countless partial and imperfect wisdoms like his own, is alone equal to this mightiest of social tasks. A clear recognition of man's conditional capacity for ruling himself and others is the first requisite of constitution making.

Because of the Conservative's view of the nature of man, it is not surprising that a conservative is not enthusiastic about assigning vast amounts of governmental power to men. Rather, the conservative is interested in restraining the government official in his tasks by custom and tradition, by law and by other checks including that of re-election.

A third tenet of conservatism is reverence for history and tradition.

Political conservatism has been called the "politics of prescription". The view is that the source and authority of institutions is their sheer weight of age, the fact of their existence "time out of mind". What this amounts to is that the conservative places greater trust in tradition and history than in man's reason and his abstract theories as a guide for action.

History and tradition for the conservative is not a static but a living thing. It is constantly changing, but always leaves society
firmly rooted in the past. When change appears imminent or necessary, the proposed innovations are subjected to the tests of observation and experience, and, when the change is accepted, it is always within the framework of tradition. The new must always be rooted in the old. The conservative does not seek to maintain the status quo but he does hold that any innovation must clearly offer the expectation rather than just the possibility of improvement.

It is true that the conservative does not early anticipate change and this has led to the charge that he will not accept change. Burke, however, indicated the importance of change with respect to the state when he said, "A State without the means of some change is without the means of its conservation". Burke also thought that world leaders should remain flexible in their outlook and stated, "A disposition to preserve and an ability to improve taken together, would be my standard of a statesman." With respect to the relation of conservatism and the real life of politics, Quentin Hogg said:

The function of Conservatism is to protect, apply and revive what is best in the old. He therefore is the true Conservative who seeks to fit in the old culture, the old humanism, the old Christian tradition of Europe to the world of radar and the atomic bomb, in such a way that our Christianity masters the bomb and not the bomb our Christianity.

It is not accurate then to describe Conservatism as looking solely to the past. It is more accurate to characterize Conservatism as looking to the past as a guide for the future.
A fourth tenet of Conservatism is a respect for private property.

Savastano in his Case for Conservatism stated that, "The principle of private property is inviolable. Where the sanctity of property is disregarded, freedom is restricted, and state authority turns into oppression."

The conservative's insistence upon private property has led to the charge that he is interested primarily in protecting himself economically and that he is not interested in the welfare of society generally. However, the conservative's concern for private property does not lie entirely upon a personal economic basis.

The conservative holds that private property provides a sphere within which the individual can exercise the faculties of a free man through personal choice and decision. In addition, private property provides an incentive for productive work by the citizens of a community. Moreover, the conservative holds that private property is the most important single technique for the diffusion of economic power. It is true that there are hazards in private property because one or a few may gain excessive economic strength. However, there are other institutions which can function to prevent abuse, especially the government. In any case the conservative maintains that the hazards of private property are less than the alternative of government ownership.

A fifth tenet of Conservatism is that man is both an individual and a social being.
Although the conservative is charged with being wholly concerned with the individual, in reality he holds that besides being an individual man will find fulfillment only in society. Society is something more than the total of individuals living in a community, and it is of value to man. Burke emphasized that "Society is essential to (man's) physical and spiritual existence; government serves him as the chief agent of society".

When a Conservative speaks of rights, he is not only thinking of individual rights but of collective ones as well. Russell Kirk has said, "The true rights of man, then, are equal justice, security of labor and property, the amenities of civilized institutions, and the benefits of orderly society." Rossiter observed:

> These rights are both natural and social--natural because they belong to man as man, are part of the great scheme of nature, and are thus properly considered the gift of God; social because man can in fact enjoy them only in an organized community.

A sixth tenet of conservatism is limited government.

All of the foregoing has brought us to consider the conservative idea of government. The Conservative holds that the institution of government is limited in its ability to meet all the needs of man and should be restrained from assuming excessive responsibilities. Clinton Rossiter emphasized the point by saying, "Government cannot by nature solve all or even a majority of (man's) problems."

A conservative attempts to distribute the responsibilities for a well-ordered society among the numerous institutions rather than just
assigning them to the government. Individuals, churches, schools, governments, private businesses, all should share in maintaining a well-ordered society. In this way no single institution is loaded beyond its capacity.

With respect to the government the conservative is concerned that adequate checks are employed to keep the institution and its policies in harmony with the will of the people. Some of the techniques for checking which are approved by the conservative includes separation of powers, checks and balances, federalism and periodic elections. The conservative heartily approves the concept of constitutionalism which means essentially that the government is limited by law.

The checks upon the government are sometimes viewed by the liberals as impediments to dynamic action, but to the conservatives they provide restraints and guides to prudent action.

This presentation today is by no means exhaustive, but I should like to mention a seventh tenet of conservatism--a preoccupation with values.

This last tenet I am mentioning is not discussed as directly in the literature on Conservatism as the preceding ones I have mentioned. Nevertheless, I think that a preoccupation with values has been a part of philosophical conservatism since Burke.

The father of philosophical conservatism, Edmund Burke, was not a man who unthinkingly approved any action of an old institution, even one as venerable as parliament. This man, who was himself a member of Parliament, stood in the House and denounced the government for its actions relative to the American colonies. Why did he challenge his own govern-
ment for its actions? The reason is that he held the colonials were
fighting for the basic values for which England had stood and which
England was temporarily forsaking. He approved the colonial's actions in
fighting to conserve those values they had been taught by their motherland.

In this day when so many organizations are being established, programs
launched and plans presented which employ the term conservative, I would
like to encourage you college students to observe them carefully and de-
termine whether they are designed to conserve the values of our society.
Unless they do they are not actually conservative.

In closing, I think you would be justified in inquiring how these
criteria could be applied in assessing whether a program is conservative
or not. One way to approach the problem is to ask yourself several
questions. Does the program seem inherently right? Is the program in
harmony with our historical and institutional development? Does the
program reinforce the traditional values of our society? These questions,
when answered in the affirmative point in the direction of a program in
harmony with the tenets of philosophical conservatism.
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