

## CHAPTER III

---

# *The Other Sixties*

The academy is no longer a comfortable fiefdom of the Left; it has become instead what it ought to be, a battleground of ideas.

M. Stanton Evans<sup>1</sup>

“THE CENTER THAT HAD more or less held in the late 1950s,” wrote the historian James T. Patterson, “cracked in the 1960s, exposing a glaring, often unapologetic polarization” between generations, races, genders, and social classes.<sup>2</sup> It split apart because of a seemingly unending succession of cruel and mocking events. One president was assassinated, and another decided he did not dare run for reelection. The civil rights movement transformed the way America looked at its black citizens, but the leader of the movement was foully murdered in a Memphis motel. The most powerful nation in the world committed half a million men and \$150 billion to defeating communism in Vietnam and was fought to a standstill by a tiny Third World nation. Millions cheered John F. Kennedy

1. M. Stanton Evans, *Revolt on the Campus*, Chicago, 1961: 190.

2. James T. Patterson, *Grand Expectations: The United States, 1945-1974*, New York, 1996: 457.

when he declared that “we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and success of liberty,” but eight years later, more than 600,000 people were participating in antiwar “moratorium” demonstrations in Washington, D.C. Eight million young people happily enrolled in the nation’s colleges and universities which by the end of the decade were riven by anger, fear, violence, and death.

Other historians have taken a less apocalyptic view of the era. For instance, one wrote that the 1960s were “the longest period of uninterrupted growth in United States history.” Untouched by either the Great Depression or World War II, the young men and women of the 1960s were more self-confident and self-centered than their parents or grandparents. Many came to believe they had “the knowledge and the resources to create a progressive, advanced society like none before,” not only in American but in human history.<sup>3</sup>

The academy shared in the hubris. College and university officials, according to Diane Ravitch, foresaw “no dark clouds on the horizon, not even the problem of financing, which seemed manageable in a thriving economy.”<sup>4</sup> No one anticipated that the openness of America’s campuses would make them staging grounds for youthful revolutionaries who “tried to destroy the one institution in American society that provided a sanctuary for their views.” How ironic, Ravitch pointed out, that the freedom to teach and learn was attacked not from the Right but by “student ideologues” of the Left and “their campus sympathizers.”<sup>5</sup>

What many accounts of the 1960s leave out is the remarkable rise of the Right that successfully challenged the liberal political establishment throughout the decade. Conservatives nominated an uncompromising conservative—Barry Goldwater—as the presidential candidate of a major political party (a feat not accomplished since Calvin Coolidge headed

3. Ibid: 451-452.

4. Diane Ravitch, *The Troubled Crusade: American Education 1945-1980*, New York, 1983: 182.

5. Ibid: 183.

the Republican ticket forty years before); elected an enormously attractive if inexperienced candidate—Ronald Reagan—to the governorship of the second most populous state in the union; and helped accelerate the forces which led to the decline and eventual fall of liberalism as the reigning philosophy of American politics.

The 1960s were a heady time for conservatives who came to believe, swept up in the revolutionary spirit of the age, that they too could accomplish almost anything through political action. But there were those who took the longer view that man does not live by politics alone. Writing to the Notre Dame political scientist Gerhart Niemeyer, ISI's Vic Milione argued that the election of a conservative as president would mean little "without an increase in the effort to restore the root values of our civilization in the intellectual center of American life." Milione conceded that such a restoration was "a tremendous task" but not an impossible one, because, he said, quoting Tocqueville, "every fresh generation is a new people."<sup>6</sup> Despite mounting pressure from members and donors, ISI stuck to its mission to educate for liberty and declined to join the political parade.

From its beginnings, ISI had been conceived as an educational institution, not a vehicle for political activism. This fundamental imperative was given concrete form by Milione's educational philosophy, shaped by his reading of such thinkers as John Henry Newman, Ortega y Gasset, and Richard Weaver. From Newman, Milione learned that fragments of the truth are found in many disciplines, so that an approach to the whole truth about man requires the student to confront a variety of perspectives. ISI therefore eschewed a narrow approach in its educational efforts and instead exposed students to the whole of the liberal arts. In an era of increasing specialization and professionalism, ISI insisted on the importance of traditional broad learning.

From Ortega, Milione learned that true education involves the cultivation of cultural norms which are the preconditions of sound judgment. These norms represent the best insights of the past, and Milione believed

6. E. Victor Milione to Gerhart Niemeyer, November 6, 1964, ISI Archives.

that in the twentieth century, it was particularly important to remind the rising generation—hubristic in every age, but especially so in an age of scientific and technical progress—about the great achievements of the Western tradition. ISI necessarily endeavored to distinguish the truly profound truths from passing fads. In so acting, it sought nothing less than to conserve Western civilization itself.

From Weaver, Milione learned a lesson which would distinguish ISI from almost every other educational organization—students are not “objects” but individuals. They should not be used to achieve any political end but should be allowed to develop their own intellectual abilities and cultural interests. Students themselves are the end, and ISI existed for their sake. When students encountered ISI for the first time, they were often baffled by an organization which seemed to have no ulterior motive in dispensing its largesse. But when they discovered that what seemed to be true of ISI was indeed true, they were captivated by the idea of education *qua* education—a reflection of what university learning ought to be but so often was not.<sup>7</sup>

In mid-1961, Frank Meyer drafted and Gerhart Niemeyer revised a statement of principles for ISI which, while never formally adopted, reflected and still does reflect more than forty years later ISI’s basic philosophy:

- Man’s activities are guided by moral law, founded in the nature of things.
- Political power is legitimate only as it defers to this moral law.
- Government’s functions are the preservation of public peace, the maintenance of justice, and the defense of the Republic.
- Free government presupposes the rule of law; personal separation of political and economic power.
- The right of private property is an essential condition of independence.<sup>8</sup>

7. Based on a telephone interview of E. Victor Milione by Mark Henrie, July 15, 2003.

8. Working Draft written by Frank Meyer and revised by Gerhart Niemeyer, March 13, 1961, ISI Archives.

### Liberal Harvard

The urgent need to provide an alternative view to the prevailing ethos of the academy was confirmed in a 1960 poll of Harvard undergraduates conducted by the editors of the student-run *Harvard Crimson*, under the guidance of sociologist David Riesman. The paper headlined its report, “Moderate Liberals’ Predominate Politically: Lectures, Course Reading Influence Shift to Left.” The *Crimson* pointed out that while a large number of students identified themselves as “liberal,” their political views were “decidedly radical”—one-seventh supported “full socialization of all industries,” more than a fifth favored socialization of the medical profession, nearly a third believed that the federal government should “own and operate all basic industries,” two-thirds supported wage and price controls to check inflation.

Indeed, wrote the *Crimson*: “Federal aid is rapidly gaining the status of a magic word. Surrounded by a climate of liberalism, most Harvard undergraduates seem ready to accept increased Federal activity in almost any area of national life.”<sup>9</sup> For the most part, the *Crimson* stated, students did not arrive at Harvard with these beliefs but picked them up from class lectures and assigned textbooks that consistently leaned to the Left. The result was that 70 percent had changed since their freshman year either “from conservative to more liberal” or “from liberal to more liberal.”<sup>10</sup>

Although Vic Milione conceded (in a letter to a potential supporter) that what happened at Harvard did not necessarily “happen in equal measure elsewhere,” it was safe to assume that *all* students were influenced by their teachers and acquired thereby “beliefs which they will retain, most likely, for life.”<sup>11</sup> The Harvard undergraduate poll demonstrated that no school, not even the most tradition-bound, was immune to the virus of collectivism.

ISI stepped up its distribution of pamphlets and books and its spon-

9. William F. Buckley Jr., “Harvard Says It Loud and Clear,” *National Review*, January 16, 1960: 44.

10. *Ibid.*

11. E. Victor Milione to Robert Fotte, Jr., January 17, 1964, ISI Archives.

sorship of speakers and seminars and held its first summer school in 1960 at Grove City College in Western Pennsylvania. With total expenses of about \$10,000, the school represented a major commitment by ISI. In addition to four-week courses in economics and persuasive speaking by Grove City faculty Hans Sennholz and William Teufel, a veritable Who's Who of American conservatism addressed the thirty-five students (six of them female) who immersed themselves in conservative ideas for a full month. One of the young ladies was Annette Courtemanche of New York's Molloy College, whose very Catholic mother contacted ISI to inquire about the nature of the accommodations. Milione assured Mrs. Courtemanche that her beautiful twenty-year-old daughter would be perfectly "safe"—as indeed she was, except from the subtle blandishments of faculty member Russell Kirk, whom she married four years later.<sup>12</sup>

One-week courses at the Grove City summer school were conducted by political scientist Karl Cerny of Georgetown University, economist David McCord Wright of McGill University, and international relations professor Stefan Possony of Georgetown. Lecturers who spent one or two days were political scientist Anthony T. Bouscaren of LeMoyne College, law professor Sylvester Petro of New York University, the ubiquitous William F. Buckley Jr., FEE president Leonard Read, and ISI trustee Lemuel R. Boulware. As important as the lectures themselves were the frequent opportunities for the students to talk informally with Kirk, Buckley, Sennholz, et al, at breakfast, lunch, dinner, and late into the evening. (Russell Kirk enlivened the nights with his ghost stories.) At this and ensuing summer schools, more than one student summed up his experience by saying simply: "It changed my life."

Out in America's heartland, Don Lipsett was a whirlwind of activity, setting up ISI chapters, arranging for outside speakers, encouraging campus publications, and finding time to establish the Indiana Conservative Club, whose intellectual standards were impressively high. The club's

12. Remarks by E. Victor Milione and Annette Kirk at testimonial dinner for Milione at the annual meeting of the Philadelphia Society, April 13, 2002, in Philadelphia.

weekend seminar in early November 1960, for example, featured Milton Friedman, Frank Meyer, and Richard Weaver—all for a seminar registration fee of \$20 plus \$8.50 a day for room and board. The willingness of the prominent conservatives to accept far less than their normal fee was due to Lipsett's persuasive argument that they would be addressing a group of future conservative leaders.

At the seminar—and a subsequent ISI meeting—Friedman offered the encouraging news that there had been “a drastic change over the last ten or twenty years in the teaching of economics in American universities and colleges.” In the late 1930s, he said, the University of Chicago was almost the only U.S. institution “at which there was a substantial group of believers in a free enterprise system.” Today, said Friedman, there were “young, able, vigorous teachers of a free market persuasion” widely spread over the country. The reasons for the change, Friedman argued, were the failure of centralized control in Britain and other countries and the widespread “disenchantment with the Soviet Union.”<sup>13</sup>

ISI activities in Lipsett's first full year as Midwest director reflected the traditionalist/libertarian/anti-Communist character of the conservative movement. There was a seminar entitled “The Moral and Economic Case for the Free Society,” featuring FEE's Edmund Opitz and Dean Ben A. Rogge of Wabash College, and held in Indianapolis. And there were speakers like Representative Donald Jackson of California, a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, who showed the riveting documentary film *Operation Abolition* before a capacity audience at Indiana University, and discussed the Left's concerted efforts to abolish the Committee.

Lipsett's \$6,000 annual salary and most of the expenses of the Midwest office were paid by Milwaukee businessman William H. Brady, who was impressed by the young Hoosier's unflagging energy and appreciated his quirky humor, seen in the “super-secret” Stephen Decatur Society, which Lipsett founded in 1961. The Society's red, white, and blue letter-

13. Milton Friedman, remarks at a special ISI meeting, November 19, 1960, ISI Archives.

head provided no address, telephone number, or names of officers. An unsigned two-page document explained that the Stephen Decatur Society stood firm for America First and against “Socialism, Liberalism, Atheistic Communism, Foreign Aid Giveaways, The Godless U.N., Egghead Conspiracy, Planned Parenthood, The Urban Renewal Hoax, Fluoridation ... Gnosticism and Entangling Alliances (partial list).” The Society collected no dues or fees, it was explained, because it was comfortably financed by an “extensive holding of Imperial Habsburg Gold Bonds, Imperial Russian Bonds, Chinese Imperial Railway Bonds ... gold bullion, enriched Uranium (for maximum fallout), numbered deposits in the Liechtensteiner Staatsbank and several leading Geneva houses (partial list).”<sup>14</sup> Conservatives vied to become “members” of the nonexistent society and relished letters from “Commodore” Lipsett (the Society’s very unofficial secretary) through the years.

Lipsett’s industry caught the attention of *National Review* publisher William A. Rusher, an influential mentor to many young conservatives. “Ordinarily I am skeptical about ‘field men’ as a genre,” Rusher wrote Milione, but Lipsett “does a fine, solid job for you, and is worth every cent. I am sure you must be proud of him.”<sup>15</sup>

### **A Special Meeting**

Lipsett helped to organize in November 1960 a special Indianapolis meeting of ISI’s trustees and advisers at which students from Northwestern University, DePauw University, the University of Wisconsin, and Earlham College reported on the state of conservatism at their schools. Thomas C. Huston was the founder and first president of the Indiana University Conservative League and later chairman of Young Americans for Freedom and a White House aide to President Richard Nixon. He said that while Indiana was considered “basically a conservative school,” left-liberal faculty “dominate intellectual discussion on the campus.” As a result,

14. Letterhead of and memorandum about the Stephen Decatur Society, Donald Lipsett Personal Archives.

15. William A. Rusher to E. Victor Milione, October 17, 1961, ISI Archives.

students moved to the left during college because “the average student, particularly at the freshman and sophomore level, is much more affected by the teaching of his faculty instructors than he is by his family background.” ISI, Huston said, “performs a tremendously important task in getting out the intellectual material.” Anne Husted, secretary of the DePauw Conservative Club and future contributor to leading conservative magazines, suggested that the main problem at DePauw was that students knew very little about conservatism. “ISI,” she said, “is the only channel through which we are able to obtain ... conservative literature.”<sup>16</sup>

Robert Croll of Northwestern University, the organizer of Youth for Goldwater for Vice President at the 1960 Republican National Convention and a future professor of political science, praised ISI for the Chicago seminars and their “noted conservative speakers” and for publishing *The Individualist*, which provided “a vehicle for student writers” like himself. Roger Claus, who helped found the student magazine *Insight and Outlook* at the University of Wisconsin, talked about the difficulties of campus publishing and revealed that financial support was easier to obtain “through advertisers than contributors.” When asked for suggestions about possible improvements in *The Individualist* and other ISI publications, the students said they would like “more introductory material” about conservatism, more humor, “ammunition” on academic freedom—a favorite faculty topic—reduced subscription rates for *National Review* and *Modern Age*, and “case studies” on the most current campus issues, like the National Student Association and the United Nations.<sup>17</sup>

A visibly moved Frank Chodorov, now in his seventy-third year and in poor health—he would suffer a debilitating stroke the following year—responded, “This meeting has been like a birthday present to me.” Like all old men, he said, “I dote on my grandchildren. But, I get the same pleasure out of hearing you young folks tell me how you are carrying the ball for conservatism. God bless you.”<sup>18</sup>

16. Thomas C. Huston and Anne Husted, remarks at ISI luncheon meeting, June 15, 1961, ISI Archives.

17. Minutes of ISI Special Meeting, November 19, 1960, ISI Archives.

18. Frank Chodorov: *Ibid.*

At the same meeting, Richard Weaver was asked to say a few words about “what students are thinking today.” In the main, the University of Chicago professor replied, student thinking reflected the thinking of the faculty because “undergraduate students tend to live in the shadow of their professors.” And in general, the undergraduate faculty was thinking “as it has been ... since the 30s, 40s, and 50s,” with an occasional “break in the line.” More faculty “breaks” would occur, Weaver believed, if books were written that “can not be shaken ... books such as Eric Voegelin’s great series on order and history; Professor Friedman’s books on economics; Leo Strauss’s books on political science; and books like James Burnham’s *Congress and the American Tradition*.”<sup>19</sup>

As for students, Weaver concluded, it would not suffice to “invite them to fold their hands and say, ‘I’m a conservative, look at me.’” That was, he insisted, too static a role for young people “full of energy and enthusiasm and ideals.” ISI, Weaver said, had “to give them some image to fight for, some objective to contend for, some picture of the society we would like to live by, which will require a lot of effort to create, or perhaps recover.”<sup>20</sup>

Weaver was reiterating a central argument of ISI founder Chodorov—true individualism had to be presented to restless inquisitive students as “something new and different.”<sup>21</sup>

M. Stanton Evans, who would publish *Revolt on the Campus* (describing the conservative renaissance at a growing number of schools) the following year, informed the trustees at the November meeting that conservatism had become a significant presence on many campuses, including his alma mater Yale. He had visited Yale earlier in the year and had been “amazed” to discover conservatives everywhere—writing for the newspaper, running the Political Union, keeping the Calliopean Society going, bringing in speakers nearly every week, and establishing a Young

19. Richard Weaver, remarks at ISI special meeting, November 19, 1960, Indianapolis, ISI Archives.

20. *Ibid.*

21. Frank Chodorov, “For Our Children’s Children,” *Human Events*, September 6, 1950.

Republican Club. While admitting that the majority of students were “what we might call liberals,” Evans said that 5 percent were “articulate, forceful and resourceful” conservatives. In twenty years, he predicted, they would be “the nation’s journalists, teachers, clergy, and leading businessmen.” In fact, he said, the conservative movement in fifteen or twenty-five years “is going to be taking possession of the seats of power in the United States.” ISI, Evans declared in a final flourish, “has generated this [movement] and made it possible.”<sup>22</sup>

Evans was warmly applauded, more for the sentiment expressed than from any conviction that his prediction would come to pass. After all, John F. Kennedy had just been elected president, Fidel Castro ruled Cuba, the captive nations of Eastern and Central Europe, after the brutal suppression of the Hungarian uprising by the Soviets, seemed more captive than ever, Bob Taft and Joe McCarthy were dead, and only Barry Goldwater was consciously articulating the conservative position in the Senate and across the country.

And yet, twenty years later almost to the day, Ronald Reagan, a self-described and proud conservative, would be elected the fortieth president of the United States of America along with a Republican Senate.

### **A Political Force**

By mid-1961, evidence of conservatism’s accumulating political power had become abundant. Goldwater’s political manifesto, *The Conscience of a Conservative*, made the *New York Times*’s best-seller list, and the senator’s national approval rating rose sharply in the Gallup Poll. The circulations of *National Review* and *Human Events* steadily increased until both topped 100,000, due largely to the Goldwater phenomenon. Young Americans for Freedom held a rally for Goldwater and other conservative celebrities in New York City’s Manhattan Center and turned away thousands, inspiring YAF to lay plans for a rally the following year in historic Madison Square Garden. There was also the far-right John Birch Society, which

22. M. Stanton Evans, remarks at a special ISI meeting, November 19, 1960, Indianapolis, ISI Archives.

distributed so many incendiary books, pamphlets, and bumper stickers (a favorite: “Get the U.S. Out of the UN and the UN Out of the U.S.”) that liberals decided to try to bury it.

President Kennedy delivered a major speech in the fall of 1961 in which he urged Americans to reject “fanatics” who found “treason” everywhere and did not trust the people. Although Kennedy did not name the “fanatics,” the *New York Times* did so in its front-page story about his speech, mentioning the John Birch Society and the paramilitary Minute-men.<sup>23</sup> Over the objections of William Rusher, Frank Meyer, and new *NR* senior editor William Rickenbacker, editor in chief William F. Buckley Jr., supported by James Burnham, wrote a *National Review* editorial reading Birch Society founder Robert Welch out of the conservative movement.

Noting the criticism of Welch by such respected anti-Communists as Barry Goldwater, Walter Judd, Fulton Lewis, Jr., and Russell Kirk, the *National Review* editorial concluded that a love of truth and country called for the firm rejection of Welch’s “false counsels”—the JBS magazine *American Opinion* described America as “50-70 percent Communist-controlled.” Anticipating a sharp reaction, Buckley wrote, “There are bounds to the dictum: Anyone on my right is my ally.”<sup>24</sup>

But the conservative movement had to accomplish another task before it could operate effectively in the political realm—it had to be philosophically united. Traditionalists and libertarians had been snapping at each other in the pages of *The Freeman* and *National Review* for years. Frank Meyer, the former Communist organizer turned conservative strategist, decided the time had come to seek a consensus of principle. Through articles, books, and long late-evening telephone calls, Meyer communicated his synthesis of the disparate elements of conservatism which came to be called fusionism.

The fundamental idea of fusionism, the historian George H. Nash has written, was that “the freedom of the person [is] the central and primary end of political society.” The state had only three limited functions:

23. William A. Rusher, *The Rise of the Right*, New York, 1984: 121-123.

24. “The Question of Robert Welch,” *National Review*, February 13, 1962: 83-88.

national defense, the preservation of domestic order, and the administration of justice between citizens. The “achievement of virtue” was not a political question—indeed it was not even the state’s business. Freedom, Meyer argued, was the indispensable condition for the pursuit of virtue. Freedom was the ultimate *political* end; virtue was the ultimate end of man as man.

And yet Meyer insisted that modern American conservatism was not classical liberalism, which had been significantly weakened by utilitarianism and secularism. Most classical liberals, he charged, were seemingly unable to distinguish between “the *authoritarianism*” of the state and “the *authority* of God and truth.” Although not then a Christian, Meyer declared that conservatives were trying to save the Christian understanding of “the nature and destiny of man.” To do that, they had to absorb the best of both branches of the divided conservative mainstream. Moreover, Meyer insisted that he was not creating something new but simply articulating an already existing conservative consensus forged by the Founding Fathers in 1787 with the writing of the Constitution.<sup>25</sup> Regardless of their philosophical orientation, Nash observed, all conservatives—from Hayek to Weaver—thought that the state should be circumscribed and were deeply suspicious of governmental planning and attempts to centralize power. They defended the Constitution “as originally conceived” and opposed the “messianic” Communist threat to “Western civilization.”<sup>26</sup>

ISI was the main institution through which this debate took place, sponsoring, for example, a Chicago seminar at which libertarian Ralph Raico of the University of Chicago and conservative Robert Croll of Northwestern debated the question, “Individualist, Libertarian or Conservative—Which Are We?” After quoting Hayek that any connection of individualism with conservatism was always “more or less accidental,” Raico declared that the purpose of individualists and libertarians as opposed to the “medieval impulses” of conservatives was “to *transform* existing society into a new order, based—absolutely—on private property and its cor-

25. George H. Nash, *The Conservative Intellectual Movement in America: 172-175*.

26. *Ibid.*: 161.

ollary, individual freedom.” Drawing upon Russell Kirk, Croll responded that reason alone, even freedom alone, was not enough. “Conservatism,” said the future professor, was founded on concepts about “the nature of man and of society” which did not share “the secular rootlessness and shifting philosophical foundations that are so characteristic of the ‘liberal’ mind in both its classical and collectivist forms.”<sup>27</sup>

In an influential paper prepared for an ISI seminar, Richard Weaver discussed the “common ground” of conservatives and libertarians—constitutional government with its list of “thou shalt nots” to the governors. Both want, said Weaver, “a settled code of freedom for the individual.” In addition to this shared *political* position, conservatives and libertarians agreed philosophically that “there are operating laws in nature and in human nature which are best not interfered with or not interfered with very much.” If you tried to change or suspend them by government fiat, Weaver said, “the cost is greater than the return, the disorganization is expensive, the ensuing frustration painful.”<sup>28</sup>

Russell Kirk made much the same point about the centrality of the Constitution to conservatism in the closing pages of *The Conservative Mind*, arguing that the principal interests of true conservatism and old-style libertarian democracy were converging. Confronted by collectivists and the architects of the New Society, Kirk said, conservatives must “defend constitutional democracy as a repository of tradition and order” while classical liberals (whom he called “intelligent democrats”) must “espouse conservative philosophy as the only secure system of ideas with which to confront the planners of the new order.”<sup>29</sup>

Although both traditional conservatives and libertarians chafed at and often challenged fusionism in the years to come (young libertarians attempted a takeover of YAF but were decisively defeated at the 1969

27. Ralph Raico and Robert Croll, “Individualist, Libertarian or Conservative—Which Are We?” *The Individualist*, May 1960: 1-2, 4.

28. Richard M. Weaver, “Conservatism and Libertarianism: The Common Ground,” *The Individualist*, May 1960: 1-4.

29. Russell Kirk, *The Conservative Mind from Burke to Santayana*, rev. ed. Chicago, 1953: 413,424.

national convention in St. Louis), it prevailed as an effective synthesis for more than a quarter of a century, until the collapse of communism in Eastern and Central Europe in 1989 and the disintegration of the Soviet Union in 1991.

### **A New President**

In November 1962, slowed by a stroke and other health problems, Frank Chodorov stepped down as ISI president. It had been twelve years since he had written "For Our Children's Children" outlining a fifty-year plan to challenge the collectivist zeitgeist on the American campus and a decade since J. Howard Pew's \$1,000 check had led to the incorporation of the Intercollegiate Society of Individualists. Chodorov had watched ISI grow from a borrowed desk, a mailing list of six hundred, and barely \$2,000 in the bank into a thriving organization with a national headquarters in Philadelphia, regional offices in Indianapolis, Indiana, and Menlo Park, California, a mailing list of some 18,000 (the great majority of them students), and an annual budget of \$200,000. He had watched, with no little pride, as his modest proposal blossomed into a comprehensive program of books, pamphlets, publications (*The Individualist*, *ISI Campus Report*, and *Under 30*), campus clubs, speakers (including, in 1962-1963 alone, respected scholars such as Milton Friedman, Russell Kirk, Martin Diamond, Thomas Molnar, Benjamin A. Rogge, and Francis G. Wilson), one-day seminars, and "life-changing" summer schools.

As Chodorov had hoped, ISI was challenging and transforming the minds of young men and women who would assume positions of leadership across the country, especially in the academy. A 1963 brochure included encomiums from several dozen students and professors. "ISI has become a nearly indispensable stimulant in American college life of informed political debate," commented Garry Wills, assistant professor of classics at Johns Hopkins University and future best-selling author and critic. "I can think of no organization," said Philip M. Crane, assistant professor of history at Bradley University, and later member of Congress from Illinois, "quite so effective and urgently necessary in precipitating a

renaissance of belief in the worth of the free society at the present time than ISI.” “For the creation of today’s solid movement of student conservatism—not yet triumphant, but surely militant,” remarked J. D. Futch, assistant professor of history at Washington and Lee University, “we have, I believe, to thank ISI above all others.”<sup>30</sup>

Satisfied that his children’s children would find a spirit of true individualism almost regardless of where they went to college, the seventy-five-year-old Chodorov gratefully relinquished the ISI presidency to the man responsible for most of the organization’s success—E. Victor Milione. Always more interested in furthering the cause than himself, Milione cut short the trustees’ congratulations, obtained their approval of the next year’s program—and budget—and set to work implementing it. “Liberty,” he stated in an ISI brochure, “requires good character, integrity, responsibility, self-discipline, initiative and perseverance.” He might have been describing himself.

Milione also came up with a new—and enduring—motto for the Society: “To Educate for Liberty.” ISI had employed several different mottos in the late 1950s and early 1960s, including “Every Fresh Generation Is a New People” (from Tocqueville) and “For the Advancement of Conservative Thought on American College Campuses.” While satisfactory, none of them evoked a cry of “eureka!” And then one day, while sitting in his small cluttered office across the mall from Independence Hall, Milione recalled the exhortation etched at the base of the Liberty Bell—“Proclaim Liberty throughout all the Land unto all the Inhabitants thereof” (Leviticus 25:10).<sup>31</sup> Wasn’t that, he thought, what ISI did—proclaim the blessings and the duties of liberty through literature, speakers, clubs, conferences, all the means of education? And while ISI did not try to reach every inhabitant of the land, it did focus on one of its most important constituencies—the student. The more he reflected the more Milione decided that “To Educate for Liberty” was a motto consonant

30. Comments by Garry Wills, Philip M. Crane, J.D. Futch, “The ISI Story—1963,” published by ISI, circa 1964, ISI Archives.

31. The following is based on the author’s interviews with E. Victor Milione, May 16, 2001, and February 29, 2003.

with the ideas of the founders of the Society and the founders of the Republic.

John Adams, for example, believed that the American “spirit of liberty” required certain “*sensations* of freedom” and certain “*ideas* of right.” Liberty for Adams, contends historian C. Bradley Thompson, meant freedom from foreign domination, unjust government coercion, other individuals, and “freedom from the tyranny of one’s own passions.”<sup>32</sup> For James Madison, writes political scientist Colleen Sheehan, dedication to the principle of liberty meant “a common commitment to the idea of responsibility and the practice of self-government.”<sup>33</sup> For Vic Milione, liberty could not be obtained nor maintained “except by those who are willing to accept individually the responsibilities which it imposes.” To emphasize the critical importance of education in distinguishing between “sound and unsound economic measures” and which form of government is most “conducive to a preservation of individual liberty,” Milione superimposed the motto, “To Educate for Liberty” on the open pages of a book.<sup>34</sup>

Moving ISI into a small suite on the first floor of the Public Ledger Building (a few blocks from Independence Hall) in the spring of 1962, Milione assembled a team of committed young men and women. Robert Ritchie, an erudite graduate of George Washington University, filled the crucial post of director of publications; the indefatigable Don Lipsett became national field director; Robert S. Luckock was named Eastern director; Frederic N. Andre (who would later serve in the Reagan administration as vice chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission) filled the post of Midwestern director; and Peter L. DeLuca III (who would help found Thomas Aquinas College in California) became Western director. Milione hired a very young Brigitte Vogel in August 1964 as his secretary and office manager; almost four decades later, the unflappable and indispensable Brig Krauss was still with ISI as assistant to the president, T. Kenneth Cribb, Jr.

32. “Atlas of American Independence,” C. Bradley Thompson, *The Founders’ Almanac*, edited by Matthew Spalding, Washington, D.C., 2002: 70.

33. “Father of the Constitution,” Colleen Sheehan, *The Founders Almanac*: 116.

34. Preface, E. Victor Milione, “The ISI Story 1963”: 3, ISI Archives.

“Vic was an early starter,” recalls Krauss, “who often had lunch at his desk. He used the telephone a lot and made many of his calls himself.” Milione was a mentor as much as a boss; almost every morning he would step out of his office to begin a conversation with someone about a book or article he had read, and soon everyone would be standing in a doorway or leaning against a wall, listening to him. “It was like a little seminar,” Krauss says.<sup>35</sup> There was very little ceremony—everyone answered the phone, did correspondence, opened the mail, made bank deposits.

“It was like a family,” says bookkeeper and later chief receptionist Patricia Mangano, who arrived in 1968 and stayed into the early 2000s. In these early years, “we did a lot of socializing together,” she says, going to concerts, the ballet, opera. “I had parties at my house and nearly everyone would come.” While “Vic didn’t take himself too seriously,” says Mangano, he took the work and mission of ISI very seriously, including the question of funding. “Vic was always adamant about keeping away from government,” she recalls. “He always said we could have gotten more money that way, but there were those strings.”<sup>36</sup>

Another early enlistee was John F. Lulves, Jr., who went to ISI lectures and summer schools in the early 1960s as an accounting major at Quincy College in Illinois and while earning a master’s in accounting at Southern Illinois University. Lulves first encountered conservatism as a teenager when he read *The Conscience of a Conservative* by Barry Goldwater and joined the activist group, Young Americans for Freedom. He discovered a deeper conservatism when he bought a paperback edition of Russell Kirk’s *The Conservative Mind* and began attending ISI events. Hired in the spring of 1965 as Midwestern director, Lulves immediately impressed Milione with his administrative talents and “voracious” reading.<sup>37</sup> The following year, at age twenty-five, John Lulves became ISI’s national director. Over the next two decades, Milione and Lulves forged a close working relationship that allowed Milione to serve as ISI’s chief executive

35. Author’s interview with Brigitte Krauss, July 9, 2001.

36. Author’s interview with Patricia Mangano, May 10, 2001.

37. Author’s interview with E. Victor Milione, May 16, 2001.

officer and the primary contact with major donors while Lulves functioned as chief operating officer, managing the organization's day-to-day affairs, especially the finances. In 1970, in recognition of his many contributions, John Lulves was named ISI's executive vice president.

But Lulves was always more than a numbers cruncher. James B. Taylor, who served as Eastern director in the mid-1970s, remembers that "John was a very good writer and was always available to critique an essay you had written." More personally, "if you had a problem, any problem, you went to John."<sup>38</sup> ISI staffers quickly discovered that Lulves was a man of broad interests—a member of the Philadelphia Society and the Society for American Baseball Research, and an avid user of the Oxford English Dictionary and his personal computer. Among his avocations, besides books and baseball, were vegetable gardening, philately, and short-wave radio. He required little encouragement to talk about the transforming power of the written word—"the jolting insights of Burke's *Reflections*, the awesome realization that Chesterton could unlock Thomism, the plain truth that Richard M. Weaver's 'Education and the Individual' was superior to most courses in education."<sup>39</sup>

Christopher Long, ISI vice president for programs in the first half of the 1990s, credits Lulves and national director James Gaston, now a professor of humanities at Franciscan University of Steubenville in Ohio, with personally maintaining "life support lines to faculty representatives" on dozens of campuses when there was "little money" for lectures and "sporadic publishing" of journals. In his seven years at ISI, says Long, who today manages a major investment company, "I learned to be a salesman, to write, to edit, to speak, to think, and to manage people. I learned an enormous amount from ... Vic and especially John Lulves."<sup>40</sup>

Reflecting ISI's close-knit culture, Lulves says the same thing about the man who hired him. "I was tremendously impressed by Vic," says Lulves, by "his integrity, his interest in ideas, his ability to integrate knowl-

38. Author's interview with James B. Taylor, May 15, 2002.

39. "Spotlight On ISI," *Eastern Region Newsletter*, Vol. 1, No. 2, January 1984: 1.

40. Author's interview with Christopher Long, September 17, 2002.

edge” into the everyday work of the organization. Lulves says that Milione was often ahead of his time, as when in the mid-1960s he foresaw the demise of the core curriculum, then still in place. In response to the coming crisis, Lulves says, Milione emphasized two things: the “idea of quality”—ISI would go to a campus with the best possible speakers and scholars; and the “idea of self-selection”—students were allowed to pick what they wanted and needed on their campus in the way of books, pamphlets and publications. “He believed in and allowed the marketplace of ideas to operate.”<sup>41</sup>

Acknowledging that ISI “didn’t pay very much,” Lulves says that “working with Vic was psychic income.” And ISI’s president kept his head, even amid the spreading political excitement surrounding Barry Goldwater and his quest of the presidency. ISI, Milione reiterated, was in the business of education, not electoral politics. When others might have been tempted, Lulves recalls, “Vic turned down a donor when his proposed project was off mission.”<sup>42</sup>

### **New Trustees—and a New Name**

To help stay on track intellectually, ISI in 1963 added three trustees with strong academic credentials—James W. Wiggins, professor of sociology at Emory University and an expert on the aging; William S. Stokes, senior professor of comparative political institutions at Claremont Men’s College and an authority on Latin America; and Thomas Molnar, professor of French and world literature at Brooklyn College and one of ISI’s most popular campus lecturers. (In 1962, Chodorov had been named honorary chairman and John G. Pew chairman of the board of trustees.) And, propelled by his own convictions and a slighting reference by *Wall Street Journal* editor Vermont Royster to ISI’s “long-winded title,” Milione initiated a lengthy debate which eventually produced a new name but retained the same initials for the organization.<sup>43</sup> Milione was propelled by

41. Author’s interview with John F. Lulves, Jr., February 26, 2001.

42. *Ibid.*

43. Vermont Royster, “The Taft Spirit: Conservatism Is Still a Force at the G.O.P. Convention,” *Wall Street Journal*, July 27, 1960.

philosophical as well as pragmatic reasons. Philosophically, the word “individualist” did not accurately represent the broad spiritual, political, and economic view of man and society that animated ISI’s mission and publications. Pragmatically, hardly anyone on the Right used the word “individualist” any more—“conservative” had become the term of choice by philosopher, popularizer, politician, philanthropist, and student.

Many in and out of the Society chimed in with an opinion about the matter. Trustee and major donor William H. Brady wrote in 1960 that if it were his choice alone, “I would leave ISI’s name exactly as it is, because I am first and foremost an individualist.” But the Milwaukee industrialist admitted that “individualists and individualism just don’t seem to have any frame of reference for most people.” On the other hand, Brady said, “conservative and conservatism are words that carry some meaning ... [and] are gaining in popular acceptance.” He found that among businessmen, in particular, “the word conservative is respected,” even among the more liberal.<sup>44</sup>

Frank Chodorov, still president in name but deferential to Vic Milione in operational matters, wrote in 1961 that if a majority of the board voted to change the name of ISI, “I shall go along. I don’t place weight on a name; it’s the substance that counts.” But since he gave the Society its name, he wanted to explain why he had used the word “individualist.” Individualism, he said, “describes a philosophy” while conservatism “is essentially a political creed.” The basic tenet of individualism “is that in the scheme of things man is endowed by his God with free will, and as a consequence, is a responsible being—responsible to himself, to society and to his God.” It therefore followed, Chodorov said, that man “is self-reliant and is capable of enterprise and initiative. He is not a product of his environment but rather makes his own environment.”<sup>45</sup>

Although no longer a trustee, Bill Buckley wrote a long letter explaining why he believed the Society should drop the word “individualist” in favor of “conservative.” Based on his experience as a lecturer—

44. William H. Brady, Jr., to E. Victor Milione, August 29, 1960, ISI Archives.

45. Frank Chodorov to William H. Brady, Jr., January 14, 1961, ISI Archives.

“twenty to thirty campuses a year”—he could report that “‘individualist’ ... is simply not used.” On several occasions, in fact, mention of the “Intercollegiate Society of Individualists” brought “a spontaneous outburst of laughter, as though one had referred to a society of Rosicrucians or phrenologists.” Buckley was also convinced that “the term ‘individualist’ scares people who might otherwise contribute money.” He recounted how a wealthy friend had begun a presentation to a foundation board on behalf of ISI with “a lengthy apologia for the title of the organization.” “I do not feel,” wrote Buckley, “he would have [done so] had he, say, solicited funds in behalf of the College Society of Conservatives.”<sup>46</sup>

Asked for counsel, *NR*’s Frank Meyer wrote that philosophically speaking, he knew no better word than “individualist” to express “the emphasis on freedom and the person” which he viewed as vitally necessary to contemporary conservatism. “Liberal” had been “stolen” and “libertarian,” he said, was “awkward and smelling of sectarianism.” But with regard to the name of an organization like ISI, “individualist” emphasized only “one side” while “conservative” was becoming the word to describe both sides—“the authority of the tradition of Western civilization and the freedom of the person.” As fierce a defender of the individual as anyone in the movement, Meyer “reluctantly” agreed that conservative should replace individualist in the title of ISI.<sup>47</sup>

Publisher Henry Regnery, who would later serve as chairman of the board of trustees and who often dispatched an emergency check to ISI headquarters when receipts were down and salaries were due, said bluntly that he had never liked the term “individualist.” For him, the word had “overtones of crackpotism”—“it reminds people, somehow or other, of nudists, etc.” He thought that ISI should drop “individualist” and use “conservative”—which had become accepted, mainly through the efforts of “our friend Russell Kirk.”<sup>48</sup> Although not the last word, donor W. Russell Fawcett of Rancho Mirage, California, summed up the view of

46. William F. Buckley Jr. to E. Victor Milione, September 1, 1960, ISI Archives.

47. Frank S. Meyer to E. Victor Milione, October 22, 1960, ISI Archives.

48. Henry Regnery to E. Victor Milione, October 6, 1960, ISI Archives.

many when he wrote that the need for ISI was “more than imperative” and it would continue to receive his support despite its “almost impossible name.”<sup>49</sup>

And there the matter rested for nearly six years while Vic Milione dealt with more pressing problems, such as dissuading pro-Goldwater donors who wanted ISI to become more political, adding campus programs and an ambitious new publication, *The Intercollegiate Review*, raising money (always a challenge), and dealing with the unexpected death of a longtime trustee and valued mentor.<sup>50</sup>

### Death of a Scholar

A native of North Carolina and an admirer of the Southern Agrarians, fifty-three-year-old Richard M. Weaver died of a heart attack in early April 1963, on the south side of Chicago, where he was a professor of English at the University of Chicago. Weaver published just two books during his lifetime, noted his longtime friend Russell Kirk, but they “made their mark in this land.” The first, published in 1948, was *Ideas Have Consequences*, a devastating dissection of modern nominalism and one of the first and most enduring works in modern American conservatism. *The Ethics of Rhetoric*, which appeared in 1953, demonstrated, in Kirk’s words, how “men’s words both reflect and form their actions,” reminding us all that “the Word may still be either holy or diabolic.” According to Kirk, Plato was Weaver’s mentor among philosophers, Lincoln among American statesmen.<sup>51</sup>

Normally reclusive, Weaver formed a special attachment for ISI,

49. W. R. Fawcett to E. Victor Milione, September 23, 1960, ISI Archives.

50. Vic Milione would complain to visitors at considerable length about the failure of the American businessman to appreciate the importance of education and the need to be patient about results. After a visit to ISI’s offices in August 1963, Richard Ware wrote, in a private memorandum for the Relm Foundation files, that Milione had discussed “the difficulty of raising money from business because of name and the tendency of businessmen to become more cautious at the same time that ‘old standby’ supporters want a more militant approach and less concern with scholarship.” R. A. Ware, September 19, 1963, Private Relm Foundation Archives.

51. Russell Kirk, “Richard M. Weaver, RIP,” *The Individualist*, September 1963: 2 (reprinted from *National Review*).

writing original essays for the Society (including one on academic freedom), speaking at its seminars and summer schools for expenses and a tiny honorarium, and faithfully attending trustee meetings where fellow trustees often strained to hear his soft-spoken comments. He suggested book reviewers to the editor of *The Individualist* and, despite his heavy teaching schedule, found time to undertake writing assignments for the Society. One week before his death, he wrote Robert Ritchie, ISI director of publications, whom he had met recently, "I hope that the wonderful work the ISI is doing will bring us together again in the future."<sup>52</sup>

Weaver's most enduring contribution to ISI, perhaps, was an address, "The Role of Education in Shaping Our Society," which he delivered in the fall of 1962 and which became a guiding document of the Society. Weaver argued against the modern tendency to make all education "an exercise in immediate relevancies or numerous courses in contemporary journalism." Weaver's emphasis, as usual, was on history. "The Man who is grounded in history," Weaver wrote, "knows something of the ever-present tension between the ideal and the prudential, so that his judgments should reflect wisdom rather than cleverness or phantasy."<sup>53</sup>

"This is not only a great personal loss," wrote Henry Regnery, Richard Weaver's publisher, to Vic Milione, "but also a great loss to the Conservative movement. He was a dedicated man and a profound thinker, and I think we should all feel privileged to have known him."<sup>54</sup>

Mourning the death of his friend and mentor and worn out by the daily demands of administration, programming, and fund-raising, Vic Milione reluctantly informed the board in the spring of 1963 that he intended to resign as president of ISI. For almost a decade, he had done it all, and with little or no help, and he was no longer able to do so. A sympathetic Henry Regnery asked Milione to reconsider his decision—"you have made ISI one of the more effective, if not the most effective,

52. Richard M. Weaver to Robert Ritchie, March 30, 1963, ISI Archives.

53. Richard M. Weaver, "The Role of Education in Shaping Our Society," an address delivered at the Metropolitan Area Industrial Conference, Chicago, October 25, 1962, and first published by ISI in 1966.

54. Henry Regnery to E. Victor Milione, April 5, 1963, ISI Archives.

organizations on the right.” And he suggested that “some reorganization should be considered so that you won’t have to be responsible for administration.” Regnery revealed that he had already written to the chairman John G. Pew and that he himself would attend the upcoming trustees meeting. “I hope very much,” he wrote to Milione, “that things can be reorganized so that you won’t feel it necessary to go through with your decision to resign.”<sup>55</sup> And in fact help would arrive before long in the person of John Lulves and other administrative staff, enabling Milione to remain with his beloved ISI and concentrate on what he did best—educating for liberty.

### Genesis of the Weavers

In a follow-up essay to his original 1950 article proposing an individualist response to the collectivist climate on the campus, Frank Chodorov had written that “it would be a waste of time to try to re-educate” the professors who had been subjected to socialist indoctrination for thirty years. The faculty, Chodorov said, would “have to be written off” until it was replaced by the “new faculty now sitting in the lecture rooms.”<sup>56</sup> But Vic Milione did not want to wait twenty or thirty years; he wanted to begin *now* to produce young liberty-minded teachers who would challenge and ultimately replace “the socialist pioneers”—Chodorov’s phrase—in the classroom. This was Milione’s dream, but without the necessary money, a dream it remained.

And then in the fall of 1963, Relm Foundation executive Richard Ware asked Milione if ISI might be interested in managing a graduate fellowship program for “college seniors who hold promise of becoming outstanding scholars or teachers in the related fields of economics, history and political science.”<sup>57</sup> Milione enthusiastically responded with a proposal, explaining that he had had “a great interest” in such a project

55. Henry Regnery to E. Victor Milione, April 25, 1963, ISI Archives.

56. Frank Chodorov, “A Fifty-Year Project: To Combat Socialism on the Campus,” distributed by the Intercollegiate Society of Individualists, c 1952, ISI Archives.

57. Internal memorandum of Richard Ware to Relm Foundation staff, November 1963, Private Archives of Relm Foundation.

for a number of years. But when he had asked businessmen for support, they had typically responded, “The hell with education; when they get out into the business world they will learn better.” Such “thinking” reminded Milione of Tocqueville’s admonition: “Nations [which] can only obtain truth as the result of experience may forfeit their existence whilst they are awaiting the consequences of their errors.”<sup>58</sup>

Milione proposed an annual program of between five and ten fellowships, each worth \$1,500 plus tuition, covering a year of graduate work in economics and related disciplines. He suggested a Fellowship Awards Committee composed of William H. Peterson, New York University; Yale Brozen, University of Chicago; and Louis Spadaro, Fordham University, all economists. A week later, he wrote that he had contacted Peterson, Brozen, and Spadaro as well as Father Stanley Parry at Notre Dame University, and all had agreed to serve on a fellowship awards committee.<sup>59</sup>

Accustomed to moving quickly when their minds were made up, the Relm trustees approved the program, and Richard Ware informed Vic Milione in late January 1964 that the foundation was giving ISI “up to Fifteen Thousand Dollars (\$15,000) plus up to ten tuitions” for a maximum of ten fellowships in graduate study in economics and related disciplines.<sup>60</sup> Relm laid down the following conditions. Each fellowship would offer \$1,500 plus tuition for an academic year. ISI would accept and screen student applications that would be presented to a fellowship awards committee which would select the fellows. Fellowships would be granted “only to fully qualified candidates.” If the candidates that year were not qualified, Ware stipulated, “awards will not be made.” There was a final request—that the fellowships not be designated “Relm Foundation Fellowships” or “H. B. Earhart Fellowships” to avoid confusion with the

58. E. Victor Milione to Richard Ware, December 23, 1963, Private Archives of Relm Foundation.

59. E. Victor Milione to Richard Ware, December 23, 1963, and January 7, 1964, Private Archives of Relm Foundation.

60. Richard A. Ware to E. Victor Milione, January 29, 1964, Private Archives of Relm Foundation.

programs already being operated by Relm.<sup>61</sup>

A delighted Milione gratefully accepted the Relm Foundation grant and its conditions and set in motion the process which in August 1964 produced the first ten fellows of the Richard M. Weaver Fellowship Awards Program. There had been nearly unanimous agreement within ISI that the program should be named in memory of the educator, author, and trustee who had contributed so generously to the Society and for whom Milione had almost unbounded admiration. Seeking to describe Weaver, Milione quoted his favorite historian, Jacob Burckhardt: “The only unique and irreplaceable human being ... is the man of exceptional intellectual or moral power whose activity is directed to a general aim, i.e., a whole nation, a whole civilization, humanity itself.”<sup>62</sup>

Over the years, Weaver Fellows would head departments at influential schools, write widely praised books, direct powerful research organizations, and serve in high governmental positions, but the first Weavers were a truly exceptional group, setting a high standard for those who followed. They included Edwin J. Feulner, Jr., the future head of The Heritage Foundation, arguably the most influential think tank in Washington, D.C.; James D. Gwartney, co-author of the textbook *Economics: Private and Public Choice*—which has been used by more than one million students in the last two decades—and professor of economics at Florida State University; and John F. Lehman, Jr., secretary of the navy in the Reagan administration and later head of his own New York investment firm. “The Weaver fellowship,” says Feulner, “was seminal for me. It enabled me to attend the London School of Economics and sit at the feet of men like Peter Bauer, F. A. Hayek, who was an occasional lecturer, and Kenneth Minogue, who is acknowledged as the successor to Michael Oakeshott in political philosophy. None of that would have been possible without the Weaver.”<sup>63</sup> “Without the [Weaver] Fellowship,” admits Gwartney, who took a leave of absence from Florida State University from

61. Ibid.

62. E. Victor Milione, “The Uniqueness of Richard M. Weaver,” *The Intercollegiate Review*, Vol. 2, No. 1, September 1965: 67.

63. Author’s interview with Edwin J. Feulner, August 22, 2001.

1998-2000 to serve as chief economist for the Joint Economic Committee of the U.S. Congress, “I would not have continued on to complete a doctoral program.”<sup>64</sup>

“It was Vic Milone and ISI,” Lehman says, “that persuaded me to pursue a Ph.D. at the University of Pennsylvania and saved me from a dull career as a Philadelphia lawyer.” Lehman remembers how Milone would take the time—sometimes for hours—to talk and debate with him and other young conservatives who visited the Society’s cluttered offices in the Public Ledger Building, drawn by the “intellectual ferment” that flowed from ISI. Today, says Lehman, who serves on the University of Pennsylvania’s board of visitors, “there is more intellectual diversity and representation of the views that ISI stands for than in my day.... ISI gets a lot of credit for that.”<sup>65</sup>

During the next four decades, ISI selected nearly five hundred Weaver Fellows, including Larry Arnn, president of Hillsdale College (“While I had the Weaver Fellowship, I was taking classes at [Claremont Graduate School that] remain the dominant fact in my understanding”);<sup>66</sup> Claes Ryn, professor of politics at the Catholic University of America and one-time president of the Philadelphia Society; William Allen, professor of political science, Michigan State University (“My Weaver Fellowship made it possible for me to ... study with H. V. Jaffa, Martin Diamond, and Leo Strauss”);<sup>67</sup> Peter W. Schramm, director of the John M. Ashbrook Center at Ashland University (“ISI had a profound impact on me—I became a political animal in the best sense. I began a life of the mind”);<sup>68</sup> John C. Goodman, president and CEO of the National Center for Public Analysis (“I was in the Columbia University graduate program in economics, and the Weaver Fellowship was very important in [its] financial support”);<sup>69</sup> Larry W. Reed, president of the Mackinac Center for Public Policy; Paul

64. James D. Gwartney in his response to the author’s ISI questionnaire, July 1, 2001.

65. Author’s interview (via telephone) with John F. Lehman, Jr., May 7, 2002.

66. Larry P. Arnn to Lee Edwards, August 24, 2001.

67. William B. Allen’s response to the author’s ISI questionnaire, July 2001.

68. Author’s telephone interview with Peter W. Schramm, December 7, 2001.

69. John C. Goodman’s response to the author’s ISI questionnaire, July 2001.

A. Rahe, J. P. Walker professor of American history at the University of Tulsa (“The Fellowship helped me get through my first year in graduate school at Yale without getting into debt”);<sup>70</sup> Bruce Fingerhut, founder of the St. Augustine Press; and Gerald P. Dwyer, Jr., vice president, Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta (“I could not have attended the University of Chicago without the additional money from ISI.... It was a dream come true”).<sup>71</sup>

“The success of the Weaver Fellowships,” says President David Kennedy of the Earhart Foundation, the primary sponsor of the Weaver Fellowship program since its beginning, “is just amazing. About 90 percent of the Fellows go on to teach or write and otherwise participate in the marketplace of ideas—that’s a much greater success rate than our own Earhart Fellows.”<sup>72</sup>

Integral to the continuing success of the Weavers were the members of the awards committee who took their responsibilities seriously, reviewing dozens of applications each year. A typical member was Peter Stanlis, professor of English at the University of Detroit and then distinguished professor of humanities at Rockford College. A widely-recognized authority on Edmund Burke and editor of *The Burke Newsletter*, Stanlis was a frequent contributor to *The Intercollegiate Review* and *Modern Age* and a popular lecturer at several of ISI’s earliest summer schools. “Ken Cribb was a student at two of my ISI programs,” he recalls—at Rockford and Hartford University. The Hartford program was divided between Will Herberg and Stanlis, and “we heard from students on what we said for weeks afterwards.”<sup>73</sup>

### Defeat But Not Defeatism

While many of the mass media recorded in admiring detail the student Left’s permissiveness in ethics and its enthusiasm for statist politics during the sixties, a few detected what *Time* called “a sharp turn to the political right” on campus. The student editor of the *Michigan Daily* explained

70. Paul A. Rahe’s response to the author’s ISI questionnaire, July 2001.

71. Gerald P. Dwyer Jr.’s response to the author’s ISI questionnaire, July 2001.

72. Author’s interview with David Kennedy, November 5, 2001.

73. Peter J. Stanlis to Jeffrey Nelson, August 6, 2003, ISI Archives.

there was “a revival of interest in individualism and decentralization of power—principles espoused by John Locke and Thomas Jefferson and rekindled by Senator Barry Goldwater.”<sup>74</sup> *Newsweek* reported that Milton Friedman was lecturing from Northwestern to the University of California under the auspices of the “paradoxically” named Intercollegiate Society of Individualists and “is to campus conservatives what Harvard’s John Kenneth Galbraith is to campus liberals.”<sup>75</sup> Stan Evans, in his book-length survey of the American campus, concluded that “the academy is no longer a comfortable fiefdom of the left; it has become instead what it ought to be, a battleground of ideas.”<sup>76</sup> The rejection of collectivist nostrums that Frank Chodorov had seen as possible if students were given the right alternative seemed to be occurring. “My parents thought Franklin D. Roosevelt was one of the greatest heroes who ever lived,” remarked Robert M. Schuchman, chairman of Young Americans for Freedom and a Yale law student. “I’m rebelling from that concept.” Roger Claus, the president of Wisconsin’s Conservative Club, admitted, “You walk around with your Goldwater button, and you feel the thrill of treason.”<sup>77</sup>

But what do you do when your political champion is trounced in the 1964 presidential election—winning only 38.5 percent of the popular presidential vote and just six states—and the media proclaim your principles to be irrelevant in a modern society (columnist Walter Lippmann opining that “the Johnson majority is indisputable proof that the voters are in the center”), and your hero’s slogan “In your heart, you know he’s right” is mockingly converted into “In your guts, you know he’s nuts”? Do you take early retirement from the political wars, or do you take heart from the reassuring words of a new leader rising in the West? Writing in *National Review*, Ronald Reagan said that “the landslide majority did not vote against the conservative philosophy, they voted against a false image our liberal opponents successfully mounted.” The ever-resilient Frank

74. “Campus Conservatives,” *Time*, February 10, 1961.

75. *Newsweek*, January 13, 1964.

76. M. Stanton Evans, *Revolt on the Campus*, Chicago, 1961: 190.

77. “Campus Conservatives,” *Time*, February 10, 1961, reprinted and distributed by ISI.

Meyer pointed out that despite the campaign to make conservatism seem “extremist, radical, nihilist, anarchic,” two-fifths of the voters still voted for the conservative alternative. “In fact,” Meyer insisted, “conservatives stand today nearer to victory than they ever have since Franklin Roosevelt.”<sup>78</sup> Conservatives publicly welcomed Meyer’s defiant rhetoric while wondering privately if victory anytime soon was possible.

Meanwhile, midway between the political enclaves of New York and Washington, Vic Milione kept a steady hand on the ISI tiller. Immediately after the Goldwater rout, he wrote Gerhart Niemeyer he was heartened that so many outstanding scholars had agreed to serve on the editorial board of a new ISI journal *The Intercollegiate Review* (the name suggested by editor-to-be Robert Ritchie), that would be launched in January 1965. His spirits were not dampened by the electoral results because “what occurred was what I expected.” The critical thing, he said, was to continue to assert the importance of education, not politics, “in shaping the course of future events.”<sup>79</sup>

Ever-increasing numbers of students agreed that a college education was critical in shaping their future. At the time of Pearl Harbor, only 15 percent of Americans of college age were attending a college or university. By the fall of 1965, 40 percent—over five million youths—were enrolled. Within four years, the figure would rise to 6.7 million, aided by the Higher Education Act of 1965, which created a \$1 billion Guaranteed Student Loan program. For the first time, federal aid for higher education was approved on its own merit and not as a response to a crisis, like the launching of Sputnik. Nearly half-a-million bachelor degrees were now awarded every year. More than \$30 billion was spent annually on education—making going to class “the largest industry in the United States” and students “the country’s biggest single interest group.”<sup>80</sup>

78. Walter Lippmann column, *Washington Post*, November 5, 1964; Ronald Reagan, *National Review*, November 17, 1964; Frank Meyer, *National Review*, December 1, 1964: 1057.

79. E. Victor Milione to Gerhart Niemeyer, November 30, 1964, ISI Archives.

80. William Manchester, *The Glory and the Dream: A Narrative History of America 1931-1972*, Vol. Two, Boston, 1974: 1342.

Even the far-sighted Milione did not anticipate how severely ISI and the other advocates of a classical liberal arts education would be tested in the sixties. The testing, in fact, had already begun at what was then the most radical school in America—the University of California at Berkeley.