

Mailed 12-7-66
from NY

December 1, 1966

Dr. Paul W. Cook, Jr., President
Wabash College
Crawfordsville, Indiana

Dear Dr. Cook:

I have your letter of July 28, 1966, and I appreciate your writing me. Over the years there have been many exchanges of thought with various presidents and deans of Wabash College; and I would like to engage in pursuing the thoughts of your letter.

I am not sure what you mean by "those who maintain a creative tension between ideals and facts," or by the statement, "a command of facts alone without ideals leads to callous opportunism and anarchy or tyranny," but then I do not know what you mean by anarchism.

It would be difficult for me to say that both anarchism and tyranny, holding separate ends perhaps, progress pursuant to an ideal which some individuals hold to be a sound ideal. Those who would be for a free society must have an ideal by which they make choices and, as a priority to any such choice, they must recognize some very practical facts; one of which is the nature of man.

Now -- your second thought, which I believe you consider an application of the first, in which you refer to the Socratic method as ideal pedagogy -- I doubt if it can all be solved by economic means. Socratic education has existed, I believe, in very important places without economic means, if I understand what you mean by that. Both pragmatism on raising money and toughness on the use of money for non-essentials are a matter of judgment, unrelated to ideals. Are you saying that ideals (at least some ideals) are not in themselves what might be described as "real" reality? Perhaps this is partial repetition of an earlier paragraph indicating I would like to have more information -- or

Dr. Paul W. Cook, Jr. - 2

December 1, 1966

better understand the information I have.

I should say I do not understand how I have helped very much at this moment. It does take a good bit of clear discussion without pre-assumed attitudes which are as yet unknown. For example, in our conversation the manner in which you advised me that you were not very happy with Hayek left me thinking that you say Samuelson, for instance, is bright and Mr. Hayek is not bright. Your test of brightness seems to be solely an exercise of the intellect. You seemed to assume that in all instances I would necessarily approve Hayek, and perhaps I would if scholarship -- brightness -- were alone the test. I believe I can consider Hayek a scholar when he wrote THE CONSTITUTION OF LIBERTY and yet disagree with the last part of the book extensively.

The above, as an assumption, might leave me with a complete lack of understanding, perhaps because of your state of mind -- which I suspect I faintly understand -- and your state of mind about my state of mind, which, at the present, that you say indicates, you, perhaps, do not understand.

Unless there is something in the "vandal's" idea which I do not fully understand, or the other distinctions I have attempted to make here which are not acceptable to you, it seems to me reasonable to assume from what you say that those who do not agree are not scholars; that ideals really are not very important. This is basically contrary to any understanding I have.

Sincerely,

Pierre F. Goodrich

P. S. At the close of the conversation I spoke of earlier, you mentioned to me some idea you had concerning a safe, new way to do things which would eliminate either the danger of the statist idea or the true free society idea, which left me quite confused but extremely interested. I would like to understand it if I can. I seriously wish you would please tell me more about this as soon as you have time to write me.

P. F. G.

PFQ:ra/hs