

CHAPTER SEVEN

WILLMOORE KENDALL—LEO STRAUSS
CORRESPONDENCE

June 11, 1949
Professor Leo Strauss
University of Chicago
Chicago, IL

Dear Professor Strauss:

Do you by any chance have left any off-prints of the two articles, that on the classical politics or that on hidden writing?

Social Research can't supply me the issues that contained them, and I'd like awfully to have them on my shelves—or, if not both, then either of them.

If you can oblige me about this, please ignore the address above, and address me at 150-95 Village Road, Jamaica, L.I. (apt. D).

Your piece on Rousseau¹ gave me quite a jolt, for which I am deeply grateful.

Sincerely,

Willmoore Kendall

* * *

Thursday, 1955

Dear Professor Strauss:

I gave one of the six lectures Bill Volker arranged for Buck Hill² in lieu of yours' a long-postponed study of the *Areopagitica*, which kept me busy in my hotel room almost every moment the Conference wasn't in session. Else, believe me, I should never have let two weeks go by without writing to say how sorry

I am to learn of your illness, and how disappointing it was not to have you at the Conference, and hear your lectures, and best of all, come to know you a little. I think I have never before had an opportunity to say how deeply indebted I am to your books.

I hope and pray for news of your early recovery.

Sincerely yours,
Willmoore Kendall

* * *

November 19, 1956
Professor Willmoore Kendall
Department of Political Science
Yale University
New Haven, CT

Dear Professor Kendall:

For some time I have been receiving *The National Review*. You will not be surprised to hear that I agree with many articles appearing in the journal, especially your own. There is, however, one feature of the journal which I completely fail to comprehend. It is incomprehensible to me that the authors who touch on that subject are so unqualifiedly opposed to the state of Israel. No reasons why that stand is taken are given; mere antipathies are voiced. For I can not call reasons such arguments as are based on gross factual error, or on complete non-comprehension of the things which matter. I am, therefore, tempted to believe that the authors in question are driven by an anti-Jewish animus; but I have learned to resist temptations. I have been teaching at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem for the whole academic year of 1954-1955, and what I am going to say is based exclusively on what I have seen with my own eyes.

The first thing which strikes one in Israel is that the country is a western country, which educates its many immigrants from the East in the ways of the West: Israel is the only country which as a country is an outpost of the West in the East. Furthermore, Israel is a country which is surrounded by mortal enemies of overwhelming numerical superiority, and in which a single book absolutely predominates in the instruction given in elementary schools and in high schools: the Hebrew bible. Whatever the failings of individuals may be, the spirit of the country as a whole can justly be described in these terms: heroic austerity supported by the nearness of biblical antiquity. A conservative, I take it, is a man who

believes that "everything good is heritage." I know of no country today in which this belief is stronger and less lethargic than in Israel.

But the country is poor, lacks oil and many other things which fetch much money; the venture on which the country rests may well appear to be quixotic; the University and the Government buildings are within easy range of Jordanian guns; the possibility of disastrous defeat or failure is obvious and always close. A conservative, I take it, is a man who despises vulgarity; but the argument which is concerned exclusively with calculations of success, and is based on blindness to the nobility of the effort, is vulgar.

I hear the argument that the country is run by labor unions. I believe that it is a gross exaggeration to say that the country is run by the labor unions. But even if it were true, I would say that a conservative, I take it, is a man who knows that the same arrangement may have very different meanings in different circumstances. The men who are governing Israel at present came from Russia at the beginning of the century. They are much more properly described as pioneers than as labor unionists. They were the men who laid the foundations under hopelessly difficult conditions. They are justly looked up to by all non-doctrinaires as the natural aristocracy of the country, for the same reasons for which Americans look up to the Pilgrim fathers. They came from Russia, the country of Nicolai the Second and Rasputin; hence they could not have had any experience of constitutional life and of that true liberalism which is only the reverse side of conservatism; it is all the more admirable that they founded a constitutional democracy adorned by an exemplary judiciary.

On Page 16 of your November 17 issue of the *Review*, Israel is called a racist state. The author does not say what he understands by a "racist state," nor does he offer any proof for the assertion that Israel is a racist state. Would he by any chance have in mind the fact that in the state of Israel there is no civil marriage, but only Jewish, Christian and Muslim marriages, and therefore that mixed marriages in the non-racist sense of the term are impossible in Israel? I am not so certain that civil marriage is under all circumstances an unmitigated blessing, as to disapprove of this particular feature of the state of Israel.

Finally, I wish to say that the founder of Zionism, Herzl,³ was fundamentally a conservative man, guided in his Zionism by conservative considerations. (Some years ago, *Commentary* published an attack from a "Liberal" point of view on Herzl. If my recollection does not deceive me, that article is sufficient to prove the point which I am making.) The moral spine of the Jews was in danger of being broken by the so-called emancipation of the Jews which in many cases had alienated them from their heritage, and yet not given them anything more than merely formal equality; it had brought about a condition which has been called "exter-

nal freedom and inner servitude;" political Zionism was the attempt to restore that inner freedom, that simple dignity, of which only people who remember their heritage and are loyal to their fate, are capable. Political Zionism is problematic for obvious reasons. But I can never forget what it achieved as a moral force in an era of complete dissolution. It helped to stem the tide of "progressive" leveling of venerable, ancestral differences; it fulfilled a conservative function.

I felt it was my duty to bring these considerations to your attention. I would appreciate it if you were good enough to reply to this letter.

Sincerely yours,
Leo Strauss

* * *

2 Dec. 1956

Dear Professor Strauss,

Thank you many times for your recent letter about *National Review* and its Israel policy, all of which was very welcome except the suggestion that I might conceivably leave a communication from you unanswered.

May I speak frankly but in strict confidence in reply to the questions you raise?

1) You should have been somewhat better pleased with our editorial stand since the Israeli invasion of Sinai and Gaza. But I agree only somewhat: our support for Israel, though all-out, has been reluctant in tone.

2) I agree completely—I personally, that is—with the position set forth in your letter, and out of a lesser knowledge and skill have urged it for many months at editorial meetings. And I am as mystified as you concerning the ultimate sources of the anti-Israel bias among my colleagues, and in Right-wing circles in general. At *National Review* anyhow, I am convinced that it is not anti-semitism (unless on the part of the one Jewish member of the Board). Bill Buckley, let me be clear, sets editorial policy, comes of anti-Semitic parents, but to me for many years the astonishing thing about the Buckley family (fascinating to any political theorist) is the elder Buckley's failure, in a context of having communicated his religion, his way of life, his political ideas, with incredible success to each and every one of nine children, to carry them along on anti-Semitism; and I have seen Bill in too many situations where he was courageously anti-anti-Semitic, to suppose him likely to carry anti-Semitic attitudes into the making of magazine policy.

3) I do have a hypothesis about all this, involving differences between me and my colleagues that appear marginally in my column and will not have been lost on so close a reader as you. We all grew up in the intellectual climate of what the magazine calls Liberalism; all of us have "broken" with the general corpus of Liberal dogma; but different ones of us are still to very different degree still prisoners to this Liberal tenet as that one; and Bill has been, for my money, particularly laggard about two of them, namely, that concerning Equality (so that on the crucial level of discourse he really does conceive of one Arab as "equal" to one Jew), and that concerning freedom of thought and speech (so that any State that moves in any way to assure homogeneity of opinion and attitude among its citizens automatically incurs his displeasure). Let me not beg either question; but I do believe that any Conservative position not based upon a view of Equality first cousin at least to that in Aristotle's *Ethics*, and a view of freedom of thought and speech not first cousin at least to Spinoza's, will end up delivering itself into its enemies' hands. The Israel issue is, on this showing, derivative from certain logically prior positions, which have dictated the magazine's policies on, e.g., the Desegregation issue (Equality) and the Dominican Republic (Freedom of thought and speech, which ends you up thinking poorly of any State so persuaded of the goodness of its goods as to be willing to pay the military-and-mobilization price for its survival, which may in a difficult strategic background be very high). This last, incidentally, is an old problem; my wife, ⁴ whom I have since lost, was "on" the Israel desk at CIA for several years, and I watched her move from a pro-Israel position—over my continuous protest—to an anti-Israel position because of "militarization" and "reliance on force in foreign policy."

4) The question quite properly arises, which I would regard you as one of very few people to whom I would give an answer, Why if I disagree do I leave my name on the mast-head? Well, for one thing, the magazine seems to me quite right and courageous on many issues, and I have learned at great cost through the years not to expect too much acquiescence in my own views from the organization in which I participate. For another, my chances of influencing it on the points on which it seems to me wrong are much greater inside than outside. And, finally, Bill Buckley and Brent Bozell⁵ are, above all in my eyes, pupils of mine, whom I feel a teacherly obligation, at this time, to "let have their heads," and whom I wish never to feel that I am asserting any so-to-speak master's authority over. Again the Equality Business; for you also as a teacher must know that one often, in handling that phase where the pupil demands his head, acts "less than equal" (i.e., fails to claim one's equal "rights") precisely because one is "more than equal," and sees the dangers, for the pupil, of pressing such issues.

Please do not hesitate to write to me further if this explanation is not satisfactory to you.

I know from your pupils how reluctant you are to let go of a manuscript until it is just as you want it, but may I say I'd give my right arm to read your Buck Hill Falls lectures—with, of course, a firm promise not to treat them as "published" by dint of being lent to me. Could you conceivably be persuaded?

Yours sincerely,
Willmoore Kendall

* * *

December 5, 1956

Dear Professor Strauss:

Just as an addendum to my recent letter, how would you feel about our publishing your letter on Israel—whether over your signature or withholding your name? I should greatly appreciate a word from you about this.

Sincerely yours,
Willmoore Kendall

* * *

December 6, 1956
Professor Willmoore Kendall
Department of Political Science
Yale University
New Haven, Connecticut

Dear Professor Kendall:

I was very happy indeed to receive your informative communication, and I wish to say at once that it has satisfied me completely. I am glad that you have disposed of any possibility of misunderstanding between you and me. It goes without saying that I will observe the strict confidence which you request. Perhaps you will have the opportunity to use one or another point I made in my letter, in your discussions with your colleagues.

I did notice the change in your editorial after the Israel invasion of Sinai and Gaza, and I was glad that reality did receive some recognition after all. I was espe-

cially gratified by your analysis of the possible motives of the anti-Israel stand of the gentlemen in question, and by the statement of principles which you make in that context (Aristotle on equality and Spinoza on Freedom of Speech.) With the latter statement I entirely concur.

As for my Buck Hills Falls lectures, they had not been written up when I was stricken last spring, and after my convalescence I was completely unable, on account of more pressing commitments, to do any work on them. But there exists an earlier and much shorter version (roughly three lectures) of which I shall be glad to send you a mimeographed copy as soon as it will be ready, i.e., in about a week's time.

With kindest regards,
Yours sincerely,
Leo Strauss
LS:mfg

* * *

December 7, 1956
Professor Willmoore Kendall
The National Review
211 E. 37th Street
New York 16, New York

Dear Professor Kendall:

I have no objection to your publishing my letter on Israel.⁶ But if you do so, it is necessary that it be published over my signature. There are some minor changes which would have to be made in case of publication. I think that the sentences indicating that the letter was a private letter (that is to say, the first two and the last two sentences) should be omitted, and also, therefore, the "however" in line 3. I have been told that the "I have been teaching" in the fourth line before the last of the first paragraph, is not good English, and that I ought to say "I taught."

In the fourth paragraph, line 4, I suggest that "I should say that" be omitted. In the sixth paragraph, the remark in parentheses should be omitted because I do not like making a public statement on the basis of recollection, and I simply do not have the time to look up the article again. Finally, I was told that in the sentence beginning in line 6 of the 6th paragraph, the second "of the Jews" is stylistically awkward.

I apologize for my pendantism, but at my age I can't change any more.

Sincerely yours,
Leo Strauss
LS:mfg

* * *

Ciudad Trujillo, R. D.
9 January 1957

Dear Professor Strauss,

This is a tardy moment at which to be writing you my thanks for the two letters I have received from you since I last wrote. I am more glad than I know how to say that you felt we understood each other about the Israel issue, and the bearing upon it of modern heresies that have nothing really to do with Israel but strike at the very heart of traditional political philosophy. And I am deeply grateful for your permission to publish your original letter in the *Review*, and only hope that the printed version—from which I took the last-minute liberty of deleting the reference to my contributions—embodied satisfactorily the editorial changes you had wished. I was not able, as I should have liked to do, to see the proof before my departure from New York.

I shall be much less active in the *Review* upon my return—partly because of some things you must have read between the lines of my letter about the position on Israel, but mostly because of a too-long-postponed decision as to how to spend the late afternoon and evening of my life (I have been in the classroom only five years since 1941, the rest of my time having gone on the nation's current and future wars). Within the limits set by my economic possibilities I propose, from here on out, to avoid all forms of "activism" as much as possible, and do what I can—here the limits are not, alas, economic—with the range of problems that you have done so much to illuminate over the years. I hope, for one thing, to write at last my introduction to the *Social Contract*, which I have been turning over in my mind for many years—though not, I like to think, without having had an opportunity to talk over with you, through some long evening, some rather sharp differences between my reading of Rousseau and your own, and a certain methodological issue as well which you will hardly fail to sense in the fact of my isolating this single work for separate treatment. Concretely, I feel that the meaning of the *Social Contract* (which seems to me to reflect some very firm decisions on J.-J.'s part as to what in his other writing's must be excluded) tends to be obscured by any

attempt to deal with it in conjunction with his other works (so as to arrive at a political theory of Rousseau).⁷ (I wonder if you have ever looked at my translation, whose discrepancies from the others—and, as I learned rather tardily, from what even a contemporary Frenchman sees when he looks at the text—give away most of what I shall be saying in my introduction?)

Did I hear somewhere that you are not to be at Chicago next year? I hope and pray, if so, that it does not mean that like Voegelin you are returning to Europe.

Yours sincerely,
Willmoore Kendall

P.S. My trip here has been a great disappointment: I had had reason to believe I was to see, and be able to write about, the inner workings of this regime, which I regard as in many respects—most particularly because of the archaic concepts in terms of which alone it might be understood—the most fascinating of our time: it is Hobbes' "public-spirited" political philosophy, in your own phrase, translated into palpitating reality; wherefore to call it, as men commonly do, a dictatorship based on something called force, is to miss all in it that is most interesting. But the official decision has finally gone against my enterprise.

* * *

January 21, 1957
Mr. Willmoore Kendall
Department of Political Science
Yale University
New Haven, Connecticut

Dear Mr. Kendall:

Thank you very much for your letter of January 9, which I received last week. I was satisfied with the printed version of my letter to you on the State of Israel. There was one printing error, but these things do happen from time to time.

What you wrote to me about your own plans was very interesting to me. I shall look forward to seeing your interpretation of Rousseau fully developed. I have not seen your translation of *The Social Contract*; I have merely heard of your planning to make a translation of the letter to D'Alembert. Perhaps you will give me the reference to your translation of *The Social Contract* so that I can use it when I take up Rousseau again in my seminar. Surely there is a profound disagreement between you and me regarding Rousseau, and I shall be very hard to

convince of the correctness of your view, especially (such is human nature) since I have presented my interpretation in print.

I would be delighted to have the long evening's chat of which you speak. During the present academic year at least it would have to be in Chicago, because I am not supposed to travel during the present academic year for reasons of health. I do plan to be in Chicago next year. I certainly have no desire whatever to return to Europe for good, though I might be compelled to do so after my retirement, because of the insufficient provisions for old professors. I was shocked to hear that Vogelstein returns to Europe, and I suppose for good. I did not have any inking of this.

I hope you have found on your return the copy of my lectures on "What is Political Science?"⁸ which I had sent to you some time ago.

Sincerely yours,
Leo Strauss
LS:mfg

* * *

12 June 1958

Professor Willmoore Kendall
The National Review
211 East 37th Street
New York 16, New York

Dear Professor Kendall:

It was good to hear from you. Apart from my colleagues here in the Department and my former students, you are the only link between me and the profession. I am very anxious to make your acquaintance in the flesh. I plan to leave Chicago for two or three weeks toward the end of this month. If I could know the exact date of your stay in Chicago I would be able to modify my plans accordingly.

Your Spanish friend did not contact me. I am sorry to have missed him. I was glad to hear that you go to Stanford and keep my fingers crossed. Through one of my students (not Walter Berns) I heard that your translation of Rousseau's *Government of Poland* is ready for publication. I just wrote to a publisher suggesting to him that he should get in contact with you regarding that translation. It would be a great help if one could use your translation in discussions of

Rousseau. My book on Machiavelli is in print. I will ask my publisher to send you a copy. I hope you can review it.

Looking forward to seeing you soon, I am,
Sincerely yours,
Leo Strauss

* * *

1032 Remington Drive
Sunnyvale Calif
9 February 1959

Dear Professor Strauss,

You must think me quite mad, what with my sudden appearances and disappearances, and churlish into the bargain, what with my silence following your cordial letter of last summer. I can only plead, on both points, that the optimism expressed in my latest letter about my having at last straightened out my personal affairs in such fashion as to be able to get back to the kind of work I was doing before, and just after, World War II, turned out to be quite premature: not until two weeks ago, for example, was I able to get out from under the crushing burden of my commitments to *National Review*; the decision to come to Stanford rather than go to Europe on my Relm Foundation grant ended up, again for example, creating more—and greater—problems than it resolved (I have often wondered what prophetic instinct enabled you to comment, even last Summer, that you were "keeping your fingers crossed" about it—as, also, what precisely you could have meant. But crossed-fingers were certainly indicated, insofar as I had dared to suppose either a) that the "profession" was at last in a mood to wash away my sins and leave me whiter than snow (the invitation appears to have been extended in sheer ignorance of the "Kendall problem," and had none of the significance, as I now know, that it would have had had it come from an Eastern or mid-Western institution), or b) that I might result in my rescue from my impossible situation at Yale, or c) that by coming to California I was placing myself beyond the reach of certain colleagues' "techniques of deprivation," to use their own happy, happy phrase. All that, *oui*, and more besides, though for the rest I certainly have only myself to blame. At Stanford I have been obliged, for the first time in my life, to teach by the "lecture method;" I knew that at the time I agreed to come, but vastly underestimated the difficulties I would encounter in learning how to build a series of lectures on political theory and keep them moving without the "feel" of the

classroom situation; so that, far from having the leisure that a one-course one-seminar program seemed to offer me, I have worked like a slave over the lectures ever since the moment of my arrival.) I am, on the other hand, very glad I came: I shall never again indulge any illusions on points a) and c) above, which seems to me clear gain. I am glad to have learned to lecture—shall, because of having learned, do a different kind of teaching, when I return to Yale, that will shore up, as I could not have hoped to do before, the resistance there to the behavioral incursion. (Most particularly, I shall shift my efforts over—entirely if they'll let me—to the undergraduates, since it had become clear, by last Spring, that a graduate program in theory is out of the question: Watkins just plain does not want one; and the rest of the problem you will readily collect from this: I had five promising students in my seminar last year; all of them left Yale in June because they found the behavioral emphasis in their other courses insufferable.) Moreover, the year abroad—assuming the rest of History would have proceeded as it has done—would have been a complete bust: I would, as I now know, have had to interrupt it twice to make trips back to the States; and *les affaires* would have made constant and extremely damaging claims upon my time. So I am glad, despite everything, that I came to Stanford; though it is also true that I count the days—120 exactly, right now—that separate me from being on my way. By mid-August, I shall be settled in Madrid, and back to my Rousseau.

Forgive my inflicting upon you so much in the way of personal confidences—they seemed necessary in order to reply to your crossed fingers.

And now to the topic of this letter:

I have before me a long letter from Dick Ware, in which he speaks of Relm's interest in your Horwitz-Diamond-et-al project.⁹ I had not known, before, about the scale of it, or about the extent to which, strategically, it presupposes an analysis of the state of affairs in the profession indistinguishable from my own. I am, in any case, delighted to learn that it is nearing completion, and very much hope that Relm will come through with the assistance you require—the more since it liberates me from a disagreeable chore that I had previously felt an obligation to try to perform. Now: the question I should like to ask is this: Will your paper on Bentley cover the Bentley epigones—Herring, Truman (Truman, especially), Latham, Hagan, etc.?¹⁰ I have been working with a student of mine out here on a paper that addresses itself to that literature, and have been wondering whether you might conceivably be interested in it for your volume—and, should you be, how soon you would have to see it? (My graduate seminar this term, by the way, has as its topic The Behavioral-Quantitative Revolt in Political "Theory.") I should appreciate a word from you about this.

I have the honor of reviewing your Machiavelli for the *Philosophical Review*. I am quite drunk on it.

Are you quite mended from the seizure that prevented your coming to Buck Hill? I sincerely hope so.

Cordially,
Willmoore Kendall

13 February 1959

Professor Willmoore Kendall
1032 Remington Drive
Sunnyvale, CA

Dear Professor Kendall:

It was very good to hear from you although what I heard is not entirely good and this gives me pain. My remark that I will keep my fingers crossed was in no way prophetic but based on some solid information as to the power of the behaviorists at Stanford. Unfortunately as appears from your letter and as I know also from other sources the power of these people is not limited to Stanford. But as you rightly state we must not give up the fight and we must be happy if we can save that tiny minority which is the cream of the young generation. Do not apologize for giving me the information about yourself for I am very much interested in your fate.

You have obliged me very much by acting favorably on our application to the Relm Foundation. As for your question regarding the paper of your student on the Bentley epigones, I am perfectly willing to consider its inclusion in the planned volume. Naturally I cannot make any commitment before I have seen the paper and discussed it with my Bentley specialist. It may take some time until I can give you a reply. Will you be so good as to send me the paper.

I was very pleased to hear that you will review my book on Machiavelli for the *Philosophical Review*. The same journal had my Natural Right book reviewed by some British ass with considerable animosity. I am glad to see this is not a matter of set policy with them.

Could you make a stopover in Chicago on your way back East? It is high time that we meet in the flesh.

Cordially yours,
Leo Strauss

18 Feb. 1959

Dear Professor Strauss,

Thank you very much for your good letter of 13 February.

I must hasten to say that I did nothing so formal as "act" on the matter of your application to Reim: it was merely that Dick Ware described the project to me—I had of course known something of it from Walter,¹¹ but never the details apart from his own paper—and mentioned to me the possibility that the Foundation might interest itself in financing its final stages; and, uninvited, I wrote to say how important I think such a book might be at the present juncture, and to express the hope that they would provide such assistance as might be needed. If anything I said should turn out to be helpful in that regard, I shall be extremely pleased, as I would be at the thought of having forwarded any project in which you and your pupils were concerned. But apart from my good intentions I fear I have no thanks coming to me.

As to the paper on the Bentley epigones, perhaps we had better forget about that. David Finlay and I, not knowing of your Bentley venture, set out originally to do a paper on the whole "group basis of politics" foolishness, including Bentley; doing the paper at this point with an eye to your own volume would, of course, profoundly affect the entire argument and structure of what we shall be writing; so I rather think we had best go ahead with Plan A, and take our chances upon publication in one of the journals (I had always thought of it as destined to the *Review of Politics*). I hope it goes without saying that I am grateful for your willingness to consider it for your own volume.

Two clarifications—perhaps more, when I've hit my stride—are in order about the Stanford situation. First, the issue here does not seem to me to be—not yet anyhow—the behavioral business: it is represented in the department only by Eulau, Bunzel, and North—and, marginally perhaps, the department chairman, Walker,¹² who however is too busy becoming Dean to worry about such trifling matters. The overwhelming majority of the department, in a word, is not only not behavioral in outlook, but quite wholesomely anti-behavioral. My fairly confident prediction is that the theory post, when it is filled, will therefore go to an anti-behavioral "type" (my impression is that the latest effort to fill the post with a behaviorist concerned a distinguished colleague of yours, and petered out for clear lack of support).

Second, my impression is that I have mostly myself to blame for not having the post fall into my lap this year. If, that is, I had not cooperated by getting into a couple of bits of trouble early in my time out here, the objections to me alike on methodological and on political grounds would, I strongly believe, probably

have failed. I mean (I blush to confess it, but you had best know it from me): the whole matter has been permitted to turn upon a) the fact that I was up and down from a "flu" sick-bed the first three weeks I was out here, that my favorite cure for "flu" is buttered rum, and that, in consequence, I showed up one day at the office with rum on my breather (a more prudent man would have stayed home), and b) that I did indeed have one too many at a dinner party I attended along about the third week, and ended up in the hands of the local constabulary and, worse still, got in the San Francisco papers (which I undoubtedly would not have but for the fact that I was wearing a dinner jacket!). I do not pay certain of my colleagues the compliment of supposing that they really care about the two incidents, but they have served to eliminate my name from the horse-race for Stanford's famous not to say notorious vacancy in theory. (Actually, the whole business is even crazier than that would suggest. They have now set up a fund of fifteen grand a year to keep a Visiting Professor "rotating" in the department, so as to postpone the major decision; then, having done that, they have decided not to postpone the major decision, and to have both the Rotating Visiting Professor and the permanent appointee!)

Third—I warned you that I'd find more numbers once I had hit my stride—I may (this *à propos* of your expression of pain, for which, nevertheless, I thank you) have given you an exaggerated impression, in my earlier letter, of my disappointment at the working out of things out here.

You would, I think, be the last person in the world to whom I should speak less than candidly about these matters; but my present tendency is to regard the incidents that have eliminated me from consideration at Stanford, however much I might wish that they had not occurred, as providential. Had the thing jelled early-on, and an offer been forthcoming, I would certainly have accepted it; but I believe now that I would have been ill-advised in doing so. Stanford could offer me only immediate access to certain flesh-pots that my Yale income denies me (and that I am probably best without), that is, three thousand dollars of additional income that I don't really need, plus an easy escape from such embarrassment as attaches to my being a permanent associate professor at Yale (which again I am probably best without). But even if we concede that these are considerable gains, the costs, in my present professional situation, would have been far greater than, in the roseate blush of satisfaction *vis-à-vis* an offer, I might have noticed. In a word: accepting the Stanford appointment might well have cost me my last opportunity to go ahead and do the kind of work that my friends once expected of me; and, since in my weakness I might indeed have foregone the opportunity, I incline to be glad that the choice did not present itself. I have ahead of me, thanks to Reim, a full year in Madrid, with nothing to do but read and write; I may be

able to stretch that into a second year, or even a third; and—this being the crucial point—I am not too unhappy, given the experience out here, to be going back, at the end of whatever time in Europe (where, for reasons that possibly do me no credit, I have always done my best learning and my best thinking), to an associate professorship at Yale rather than a full professorship at Stanford. There is, to be sure, the complete impossibility of a graduate program at Yale, which I believe I spoke of in my previous letter; but the Yale undergraduates are about as good an audience as you can have and, as regards any possible wider influence, a Yale podium is certainly preferable to one at Stanford. My present mood, in fine, is not one of self-pity, but rather one of hope that I can use the time ahead of me, beyond Stanford, in a fashion that will justify some of the hopes my friends, including, I like to think, yourself, have generously placed in me. You know from Walter, I am sure, how little the Yale political science department, in its higher ranks, succeeds in interesting the undergraduates. Deutsch and Almond may change that a little, but won't change it very much;¹³ and I incline to be optimistic about my own strategic situation when I get back to Yale—partly, as I may have intimated in my other letter, because I have discovered myself out here (the thought had never occurred to me before) as an *orador de masas* (= an undergraduate lecturer who can pack 'em in and, as I hope you will believe, still teach 'em something). *Bref*: I think that in the long pull I will win the deprivation struggle at Yale; and since I think I can I think I ought to go ahead and do it.

May I confess that I have been—No, not reluctant to meet you in the flesh, but deeply concerned to postpone our meeting until I might have extricated myself from the difficulties that have kept my attention away, in recent years, from what Strauss calls the "important matters"? I sat in a bar a couple of weeks ago all one Sunday afternoon, probably not two miles from your house, and did not phone because—this may sound very absurd to you—I wanted a few more months before sitting down to talk with you. I suppose this is another way of saying that I regard myself as an errant pupil of yours, who prefers not to be seen by the master until he has caught up with his home-work (of course one never catches up, but there are degrees of arrears). Please bear with me about this, and let me say: I shall indeed be in the Chicago area the coming Summer (I do not go to Madrid until August, or perhaps early September), and hope very much that we can meet at that time.

One technical question: You speak of the second chapter of the *Prince* as indicating a caveat on M.'s part that he is speaking of a "tangled" web. I examine the chapter in vain for any such emphasis. Could you clarify this for me?

Another: Do you, by any fantastic chance, have still an off-print of your piece on the Discourse on the Arts and Sciences? I lost a huge box of papers last

Autumn, that included no less than ten or twelve of my most highly valued off-prints from writings over the years.

Still another: Do you think I might be usefully employed, once I have finished my Rousseau study, in doing a textbook that might replace Sabine in the run-of-the-mill "theory" course out over the country? I feel a considerable vocation to do such a book—not because I believe such a book to be possible (I know it isn't), but because I believe (and my ultimate modern master is Burke) it to be "necessary."

Looking forward to meeting you at last in June, I am,

Yours sincerely,
Willmoore Kendall

P.S. If I may intervene in a family matter: I strongly think Walter should be urged to stay on at Yale. His basic position there, despite the animosities he has aroused, is unassailable. (I said to him after the meeting in which Public Law was adopted as a "subject" in the department: you were just appointed to a full professorship at Yale. I still think that was a correct prediction.)

* * *

26 February 1959

Professor Willmoore Kendall
Department of Political Science
Stanford University
Stanford, California

Dear Professor Kendall:

I am very much obliged to you for your kind and informative letter of February 18. There is more than one item in that letter which demands a lengthy discussion, i.e., an oral discussion. I have in mind in particular the question of a text book in theory. I am very anxious to see you in June on your way East. My present plan is to take a short vacation somewhere in Michigan in the first half of June. I might modify this plan if I have a certainty that you would be in Chicago during the first half of June. Or could you possibly come up to Michigan at that time?

The only questions which require an immediate answer concern the passage of *The Prince*. I did not speak of a "tangled" web as you make me do; I expressed myself more cautiously. As for the passage in question, it occurs indeed at the

beginning of the second chapter; the Italian word is *tessendo*, A. H. Gilbert translates "to spin my web." As for my article on the *First Discourse*, I do not have a spare copy as I regret to say; perhaps you might approach my friend, Howard B. White, of the Graduate Faculty of the New School for Social Research (66 West 12th Street, New York 11). He might be able to get a copy for you from the stock at Social Research.

Repeating the expression of my thanks for your charming letter, and looking forward to our meeting in June, I am,

As ever yours,
Leo Strauss

1 April 1959

Professor Willmoore Kendall
Department of Political Science
Stanford University
Stanford, California

Dear Professor Kendall:

I am very happy about the prospect of my meeting you. Monday, April 27, would be alright. Could you come to my office (Social Science Building 309) at 12 noon and then have luncheon with me. I do have a class but only at 3:30 and if you would like to sit in you are, of course, welcome. (The subject is "Natural Right" but discussed via a critical analysis of Nietzsche's *Zarathustra*.) Perhaps we can also be together later in the evening.

As for your question regarding McClosky's¹⁴ reply to your note, I have not seen that reply. I believe even if I had seen it I would not have read it because of the extremely asinine character of his original statements. Still, I will try to have a look at his reply.

Cordially yours,
Leo Strauss

7 April 1959

Professor Willmoore Kendall
Department of Political Science
Stanford University
Stanford, California

Dear Professor Kendall:

This is only to let you know how happy I am that we can meet on Monday, April 27. As for Stanley Millet, he was for some years at an upstate New York college (Hobart, or so), which he left because he could not get along very well with a colleague who also happens to be one of my former students. I believe he is somewhere in New York City. He could always be reached through the Graduate Faculty of the New School for Social Research, 66 West 12th Street, New York, New York.

Sincerely yours,
Leo Strauss

Pinar, 21

Madrid

27 October 1959

Dear Professor Strauss,

My friends here (they constitute the so-called "Restoration" movement in Spanish politics and philosophy) operate a publishing house called Ediciones Rialp, which has a rather impressive list of philosophical titles (Guardini, Heidegger, Jasper, Pieper, etc.). At my urging, they have found funds with which to translate and publish your *Machiavelli* (they are also going to translate and publish my little Locke volume, which is about to be republished in America). If the Machiavelli is reasonably successful, they will wish to do your *Natural Right*, probably some time next year.

If this idea is attractive to you, would you be good enough to have the Free Press authorize the translation, and send them a couple of copies? (It would be desirable if one could come, as my review items do from *NR*, by first class boat mail.)

I believe the Machiavelli would give this intellectual climate here a jolt it sorely needs (which is what it has done for me!).

You now have three of my lads on your hands. I commend them to you, Shrock¹⁵ especially, with all possible warmth.

I am comfortably and happily installed in this Residencia and shall continue here until mid-December. I have been working intensively on the *Julie* and Locke's *Letter*, besides finishing up a long-overdue piece on Milton.

I do hope my little *Contract Social* came safely into your hands.

I never let a day pass without spending an hour with you, and that never fails to be the most profitable hour of the day.

Cordially,
Willmoore

P.S. The letter should be addressed to :

Florentino Pérez-Embid
Ateneo de Madrid
(of which he is president).

3 November 1959

Professor Willmoore Kendall
Residencia del Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas
Pinar 21, Madrid

Dear Willmoore:

You have obliged me very much by your remarks on my *Machiavelli*. This was the first encouraging response and it soothed my old heart. I approached the Free Press with your request and you or your Spanish friend should hear from them shortly. I was glad to hear that your work proceeds satisfactorily. I did receive your *Social Contract* and I liked it very much. I sent you an address on "What is Liberal Education?" and a mimeographed lecture entitled "Relativism" to your Yale address.

Hoping to hear from you soon again.

Cordially yours,
Leo Strauss

PS: The Free Press has reassigned to me the Spanish language rights. I therefore authorize you to make any arrangements you think are fit for the purpose. For reasons which I do not understand but which my publisher regards as 100

percent sound, he will send two copies of the *Machiavelli* to you by regular mail (boat). He tells me that he has had considerable experience with books he sent to Spain.

20 November 1959

Professor Willmoore Kendall
Residencia del Consejo Superior
de Investigaciones Cientificas
Pinar, 21, Madrid

Dear Willmoore:

I have only a copy of the enclosed address; the mimeographs of "Relativism" have been exhausted. But the latter article will be brought out in a collection by Emory University.¹⁶ I trust that the Free Press has sent you a copy of *What is Political Philosophy?* which just came out.

Cordially yours,
Leo Strauss

Madrid
16 Jan. 1960

Dear Professor Strauss,

I am about to leave Madrid, with all arrangements made for translation of the *Machiavelli* and its prompt publication, but, unhappily, without the two copies of the book having arrived. That is bad, since packages must be called for in person, and forwarding never seems to work very well.

Meanwhile, I have conceived the following ambition: to see the entire corpus of your work published in a good Spanish edition. The difficulties here are a) that is going to take quite a chunk of somebody's life, and b) that the somebody must be knowledgeable about political philosophy, and c) that no Spanish publisher could undertake such a project with its own resources. I have put a good deal of time here into trying to meet both difficulties: I've found my man, a teacher of political philosophy here by the name of Rafael Gamba, who however though will-

ing to devote that chunk of his life I speak of cannot afford to. And Rialp has at last agreed to publish the books, on condition I can find them a small subsidy in the United States. In a word: there came a moment when I must abandon the enterprise, to which I attach great importance, or begin to think in terms of getting some money from a foundation. I've driven what seems to me a hard bargain on both counts: \$1.00 for the translation for each completed page (of English), \$1.00 to Rialp also for each published page (of the English original).

You must not of course think I have simply taken for granted your agreeing to all this: I leave everything except the Machiavelli highly tentative (as I must until I have if not the feel then the glimpse of the money). I would have to dis-
pose *ab initio* of the translation rights to the *Hobbes*, the *On Tyranny*, the *Spinoza*, the *NR & H*. The *M* will go forward independently of any subsidy. But I have taken the liberty of writing to Reim: it would probably cost them \$3,000.00 spread over 2 1/2 years, though also of course, quite tentatively.

It would be my plan to keep control of the enterprise in my own hands; checking the translations, collaborating with Gamba on brief introductions, etc. You would have the usual royalties (8%), though they would not buy you any Cadillac (as I'm sure you know).

I assume in all this that Strauss also is an unarmed prophet, who tacitly proposes a countermovement to Machiavelli and modern philosophy not conspicuously less grandiose in conception than Machiavelli's own (you don't have to answer that!); and that anything that can be done to make *Strauss' Discourses* available to potential Glaucons in the world of another language is eminently worth doing.

Might I have your reactions to the enterprise as I propose it here?

I am trapped by snow and ice, thus tardy in departing for Paris.

Cordially,
Willmoore

P.S. You must not think many people here can read English. They can't.

19 January 1960

Professor Willmoore Kendall
Residencia del Consejo Superior
de Investigaciones Cientificas
Pinar 21, Madrid

Dear Professor Kendall:

I have to return to this more formal apostrophe since you did the same and where ever possible there ought to be equality in my opinion. As for my recent book, I did not include my article on Rousseau because I believe that the chapter on Rousseau in *Natural Right and History* is a more mature and clearer version of the same subject; if a point mentioned in the earlier essay had to be left out in the later version, there may be other opportunities for restating them. I shall be glad if you review my two recent books and I am looking forward to the reviews with eager anticipation. Thank you very much for your wishes for the New Year. I have and had the same wish for you. I have heard glowing reports of your activity at Stanford from a few students we now have here and I also read with great gusto your debate with Sibley.¹⁷ I am naturally on your side but not on every point for the same reason.

Cordially yours,
Leo Strauss

* * *

Paris [Approximately 24 Jan. 1960]

Dear Professor Strauss,

I am both distressed and perplexed by the first sentence of your newest letter. But especially distressed, and I see nothing for it but to say, as simply as I know how, how I feel about the point in question.

1. I have never—as you can see by referring to our correspondence, if you have it by you—addressed you as other than “Professor Strauss.”

2. I was profoundly—and proudly—conscious of the moment in our correspondence when you began to address me as “Willmoore.” That, since I am always *in statu pupillari* with you, seemed to me, should you wish it, only proper. But it would never have occurred to me, short of an expressed wish on your part in that sense, to change my own form of address to you. I can cite the author of a recent book on Machiavelli to the effect that there are differences in rank (obviously I

do not refer to that between an Associate Professor and a Distinguished Service Professor) between students of political philosophy, which it is of the essence of good manners and of intellectual clarity to recognize; there is such a difference between you and me—a difference that I live with as a central fact of my professional life every day: i.e., I too believe in equality where it is possible, but to put it that way is to recognize that in some cases it is impossible, and it would not be for me to say when that impossibility might have been transcended, which it would not be, for me, short of the day on which I had written something that I should be willing to hear mentioned on the same afternoon as the poorest chapter, if one there be, of your published writings. Or when I have written something that might deserve from you a note saying: You have won your spurs. I consider such a moment; but I do not think I have deserved it to date.

3. Of course such differences in rank might be overlooked in terms of a purely personal relationship (I suppose that if I had lived neighbors with Toscanini, and talked with him often over the back fence, I might have ceased to call him "Maestro," though I doubt it. Put in the context of our brief meeting in Chicago, even in the context of our common interest in a number of common friends and their careers, I should have deemed it presumptuous on my part to write either "Dear Leo" or even "Dear Strauss."

4. What I should of course most regret would be any nuance in a letter of mine that I might have wished a greater formality in our correspondence than that which had lately obtained, which is what you seem to suggest in the letter I have before me. Nothing could have been further from my intention, or my wish. Indeed, to refer again to a recent work on Machiavelli, just as Machiavelli establishes intimacy with his readers by causing *them* to commit his blasphemies, you establish intimacy with your readers by causing them to commit the acts of piety to which you seek to lead them. They come to feel, believe me, that intimacy, which however must, again I say short of explicit authorization from you, be regarded as an intimacy from them to you, and not as reciprocated as such.

5. To return briefly to the question of rank, which I like to think I may do with you without loss of dignity: I have just emerged from a ten-year period of relative inactivity in our profession; and, as I wrote Harry a few weeks ago, I come back to a profession in which you and your students have so changed the standards of excellence that I find myself writing with the lot of you—I almost said the whole damn lot of you—peering constantly over my shoulder, and you especially with that grin of yours. My great temptation is *not* to claim equality, but to chuck the whole business, as one grown far beyond my powers, alike as regards skills and native wit, and go back to the bureaucracy to earn my living.

6. I repeat that I too believe in equality where it is possible, and with respect to the things with respect to which it is possible; so I'll be equal enough to say that I think you have no right to change from "Dear Willmoore" to "Dear Professor Kendall" without the specific authorization from me (unless you wished to state a reason for having withdrawn a cherished token of regard you had yourself conferred) that I should wish before moving from "Dear Professor Strauss" to "Dear Strauss" or "Dear Leo."

I do not think the above will seem silly to you, especially as it is you who raise the issue. I simply wish you to understand how deeply in your debt I am, and how much I wish to be of service in the cause that you seem to me to have made yours.

Affectionately,
Willmoore

P.S. At the risk of whipping a dead horse, I might point out that your letters to me addressed "Willmoore" were signed by the rather more formal "Leo Strauss." To be sure, no title. P.P.S. I await with great interest your reply to my latest letter, WK

* * *

25 January 1960
Professor Willmoore Kendall
12 rue de Richelieu
Paris 1, France

Dear Professor Kendall:

I am very grateful for your letter of January 16. I cannot let pass the expressions of high praise which you bestow on my work. But I am willing to accept them as a kind of compensation for the expressions of blame which have been heaped upon me by a multitude of asses. To come to the practical questions, you speak of my *Hobbes*, *On Tyranny*, *Natural Right and History*, and *Spinoza*; by the last you almost certainly mean not my German book on Spinoza which is obsolete in every respect, but *Persecution and the Art of Writing*. To my surprise you did not include *What is Political Philosophy?*, which I would prefer from every point of view to my *Hobbes*. However this may be, you must consider the fact that there are two different publishers involved; the University of Chicago Press for the *Hobbes* and *Natural Right and History* and the Free Press for the other

books. How could I have any objections to your proposal and to the steps which you have taken already? I cannot but regard you as one of my greatest benefactors. Incidentally it occurs to me that a few weeks ago a South American publisher approached the Free Press with a view to acquiring the Spanish rights for *On Tyranny*; I do not know whether these rights apply only to Latin America or to the mother country as well. This would have to be straightened out at an early date.

I hope you have a nice stay in Paris and to hear from you at an early date.

Cordially yours,
Leo Strauss

* * *

January 29, 1960

Dear Professor Strauss:

Thank you for your letter of 25 January, even with the continued "Dear Professor Kendall."

I did not mean to omit *What is Political Philosophy?*, with which I have been living these last weeks. As for the Spinoza, I was thinking of the original edition, and have only lately obtained the *Free Press Persecution and the Art of Writing*—indeed do not really have it as of now because it is held in the French customs pending a little dispute of mine with the French customs. I personally regard the *Hobbes* as indispensable to any effort to transfer your thought to the Spanish language, though I would of course defer to your own judgment about that: it was the book through which I first knew you, and I may for that reason attribute to it a value that you would not underwrite. If the Latin American publisher goes ahead with *On Tyranny*, that would indeed be for the entire Spanish speaking world, and we should have to leave it out of the Madrid edition—not necessarily a matter of regret for, though Latin American translations are often execrable, anyone who would have chosen the *On Tyranny* as something to translate is likely to be someone who would translate it well.

All depends now on the subsidy that I have requested from Relm, though as I think I explained the Machiavelli will go forward in any case.

I find myself very happy in Paris, where my best work, such as it is, has always been done.

I think, at the present moment, we should not worry too much about the "multitude of asses": the thing about the Strauss-unarmed-prophet operation, to

my complete surprise, is that it is succeeding: Who would have thought ten years ago that it might fare so well in the APSR? And what, in the long run, are the Frederick Watkinses going to do vis-à-vis your Jaffas? Let's sit tight, and let the chips fall where they may. We are, I think, fated to be reduced to a remnant; but to survive as a remnant is to beat Fortune. Else I misunderstand you.

I greatly hope that my previous letter did not seem altogether too defensive: there seemed nothing for it but to state myself fully on the point you had raised. As for the rest, I think I know my value in the profession: I am no Leo Strauss nor an Eric Voegelin, and I begin to fear no Jaffa and no Cropsey, but I do know who the Strausses and Voegelins and Jaffas and Cropseys¹⁸ are, and like to think that being able to recognize them is maybe something. And I think I do know how to bring students to a love of their kind of learning.

I do wish we might have a long talk about this "value-free" business: I continue to believe that there is a stage of political inquiry where the "value-free" game becomes imperative—I think I see it in Aristotle, where he is willing to preserve any regime or destroy it. Jaffa tells me I am quite wrong about that.

Affectionately,
Willmoore

* * *

February 4, 1960

Professor Willmoore Kendall
12 Rue de Richelieu
Paris 1, France

Dear Willmoore:

I have your two letters from Paris and I was somewhat embarrassed by the great trouble which you took in order to clarify the problem of our allocutions. I bow to your word. I also accept your opinion regarding my *Hobbes*, because on such matters the author's judgment is not necessarily the best judgment. Hoping to hear from you again.

Cordially yours,
Leo Strauss

As from: Paris
4 June 1960

Dear Professor Strauss,

I write very tardily to thank you for your fine paper on education, which I shall cherish along with your inaugural lecture at Chicago. I am always thrilled by the clarity and charm with which you are able to say the things the rest of us can only try to get into words. I am also deep now into the transcript of your *Symposium* seminar. How I wish I might have come to you as a pupil just, say, after my *Locke* book, when I gave up on the sort of thing I had attempted in it because it seemed to me, looking out over the land, that it was an irrelevancy! (Incidentally, I have been for the first time, "working" your treatment of *Locke* in *NR & H* (following out the references, etc. and I am going to permit myself the self-admiring comment that while I was very far from pushing the argument through to the depths to which you take it, I did not, for so ignorant a man and the time at which I was writing, do too badly at keeping out of trouble with you—particularly on the right of the majority and the lapse of the law of nature in civil society (and I think I was even smelling along toward the essentially Hobbesian character of *Locke's* teaching). I note with interest that as recently as 1951 you still speak of the *Second Treatise* as a vindication of the Revolution: are you unimpressed by Lasslett's evidence as to when it was written. I am very intrigued by your not mentioning the *Letter* because I am working on it, as I think I've told you—intrigued and encouraged, because it seems to me that your "silence" says a great deal from which someone else might safely go on, as I am trying to. I feel very certain that the teachings of the *Letter* must be "dug out"—in the sense that is carefully concealed from the eyes of non-initiates.

I have this to report: the Machiavelli translation is under way in Madrid, though I should prefer that you treat that information, for the moment, as *entre nous*: *Reim* has not yet acted on my general proposal for a subsidy, which if it is voted I shall wish, for reasons I think you would respect, to make cover the *Machiavelli* retrospectively, although it will be published whether the subsidy is forthcoming or not. I do not regard *Reim* as necessarily entitled to that information. I assume you will not wish to examine the translation, though of course we will arrange for you to do so if that is your pleasure.

Might you be coming to Europe this Summer, and if so might I hope to see you? I shall continue in the South of France until early July: then Paris until 15 September; then Hossegor again until 1 October; then, for a number of reasons I shall not inflict upon you (*not* including the opportunity to see Heidegger walk

down the street, I presume with people *not* setting their watches by his passing), Freiburg; then Spring Term in Oxford, the Summer here and Paris; then—home! Cordially,
Willmoore

* * *

June 10, 1960
Professor Willmoore Kendall
BP 19 Hossegor
Landes, France

Dear Willmoore:

I have your two letters. The one regarding your publication problem just arrived. I have to think about it and therefore I cannot give you a reply now. It goes without saying that I shall do whatever I can to correct a preposterous situation but you must know that while I may have a slight intellectual influence I have no influence whatever in the field of politics, administration and business. The only hope is that I discover an acquaintance who can impress people dedicated to the practical life.

What you said about certain of my writings and especially of my chapter in *Natural Right and History* on *Locke* pleased me very much. You may know that I have been exposed to both stupid and indecent attacks on account of that chapter more than on account of anything else which I have committed. "*Locke* the liberal" is the chief or perhaps the sole idol in the temple of liberalism and whoever questions that idol is guilty of what the liberals themselves call "unorthodoxy" (see NATURAL LAW FORUM last year). You are much too modest regarding your own achievement regarding the proper interpretation of *Locke*. I never had a suitable occasion to state this in public but I am anxious to state it now, that I do not know of any other theoretical study by a man born and trained in the U.S., in your or my generation which equals in value your work on *Locke*. As for the fact that I still speak of the two *Treatises on Government* as "a vindication of the Revolution," I can only say that the pre-Revolutionary version is not accessible to me nor to anyone else: I am just trying to be a good boy and I stick to the available evidence. I am satisfied on the basis of his so-called *Essays on the Law of Nature* (edited by von Leyden) that *Locke's* basic position was established in his mind when he was about thirty. As for the *Letter*, my silence about it had no other reason but ignorance. Just as my silence on his *Treatise on*

Education, which I read only a few months ago and which, incidentally, fully confirmed my interpretation of the *Government*.

I plan to leave Chicago for the think-tank in Palo Alto on June 23 (Center for the Advanced Study of Behavioral Sciences, 202 Junipero Serra Blvd., Palo Alto, California). You will hear from me as soon as possible.

Cordially yours,
Leo Strauss

* * *

June 20, 1960

Professor Willmoore Kendall
B.P. 19, Hossegor
Landes, France

Dear Willmoore:

Just before I leave for California,—the Free Press would of course be interested in your manuscript. As Mr. Kaplan, the manager, put it, he will judge the book entirely on its merits and whether or not he can expect a reasonable profit from it. The utmost I could achieve was that he would make the final decision dependent on some one who is certainly not 100 percent in favor of the ruling superstition. This was the maximum I could achieve. As for the University of Chicago Press, the director told me that he received your manuscript only three weeks ago. He promised me that he will surely show the manuscript also to one of my "fair haired boys" (who may by now have lost all his hair which was never fair). Mansfield¹⁹ is out of reach; he will settle down in New York in the near future; Jaffa is sure that you will get a fair hearing from him because he knows how highly Mansfield thinks of you. In a very great hurry.

Cordially yours,
Leo Strauss

PS: My California address:

Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences
202 Junipero Serra Boulevard
Stanford, California

June 23, 1960
Professor Willmoore Kendall
B.P. 19, Hossegor,
Landes, France

Dear Willmoore:

I must have misunderstood the Director of the University of Chicago Press completely.

I happened to meet him today and he told me that you had not sent him the manuscript but that he has written to you that he would of course be interested in seeing it, your apprehension that the Press is sold on people like Dahl²⁰ being wholly unjustified.

On my way.

Cordially yours,
Leo Strauss

* * *

Meudon-Bellevue
10 August 1960

Dear Professor Strauss,

I hope I have not seemed discourteous by my long silence, which might seem the more inexcusable because of the trouble I know you to have taken on my behalf before your departure from Chicago. My only justification is that I have been laboring mightily at the bringing forth of mice—15 and 16 hours a day;—divided more or less equally among *The Government of Poland*, my book on majority-rule, and reading. It has, as you perhaps know, been a peculiar Summer in Western Europe; even at Hossegor. I had, in all May and June, only 7 or 8 days of sunshine; and here in Paris, through July and what goes of August, there has never been a single hot day, and only 4 or 5 on which the sun has shone more than a couple of hours: stay-at-home weather, good for work and not much else. I have put my Toleration study aside for the time, in the hope that it will fall into place better if I return to it later with a fresh mind. Both it and the Poland will be at best modest footnotes to your essays in NRH: I think both are clear instances of a "forgotten kind of writing," especially the Poland, which seems to me to have taken everybody in completely who has written on it. I find no secondary literature that treats it as in any way problematic, though the moment one raises the

LS problem of the addressee, problems leap up all over the place—many that I am by no means clear that I am competent to deal with. I do hope to make of it the first piece of work I have done in many years that I might dare to ask you to read and criticize. The Locke too, perhaps.

There are several pieces of news:

1) Reim, to my great astonishment (though they have given me, this year, everything but the kitchen table), declined my Madrid translation project. That does not affect the translation of the Machiavelli, which is en route; but unless I can find American funds the project as a whole is likely to lapse. It now lies before Volker, and there is one other possibility that I shall tell you about if anything comes of it. The translator seems to be preserving your tone and "rhetoric" extremely well—not, as you know, an easy task.

2) Mansfield has accepted my "Open Society and Its Fallacies," which gives me much pleasure. I think, however, that I shall venture to quote to you, in strict confidence of course, the most interesting passage in the letter he writes to me about it, as follows:

"I am sorry to have taken so long. The reason is, basically, that you are so much a symbol and stereotype and your commitment is so strong, that a neutral appraisal, at once technically competent and naive, is very difficult to secure; in the end I have been thrown back on my own judgment, about which I am understandably diffident."

"I cannot say you persuade me very far, but I am enough of a believer in a less absolute version of Mill to think there should be room in the Review for the most incisive and carefully developed statement of your views I have seen."

I take it one does not need to be an LS to get out of that the statements a) that some of the referees opposed the article's publication, and b) that Mansfield himself has no confidence that they were not swayed by political and personal considerations, and c) that (while his letter does not exclude the possibility that he has less than complete confidence in the referees on the other side), my well-wishers have come off rather better in his own eyes than those who wish me ill. Nothing he says, of course, apart from his saying it so frankly, comes to me as any surprise, though I confess myself mystified, not at the fact that certain people strongly disapprove of me, but at the fact that they work so hard at it, especially, as most of them (an immediate colleague of yours excepted) work hard at nothing else that I can see (an immediate colleague of mine excepted, who is learning to sing coloratura parts in baritone). It is extremely unfortunate for me that they do not realize how unimportant I am, and direct their fire at e.g. you, who might conceivably do them in one day (towards whom, however, they entertain sentiments roughly parallel to Pitt's on *The Rights of Man*: not much harm in a three

guinea book!). Of course, what continues to amaze me is the extent to which the journals remain the preserve of what you call the legitimate phases of political science. They have certainly treated me with eminent fairness during these months, though clearly there are people of great power in our little racket who would desire them not to; indeed, though I have submitted little, I have never received a rejection from one of them.

I do not agree, I think, that the article is so tendentious as to warrant Mansfield's "you do not persuade me very far," as I think it rests on a misunderstanding, on his part, of what exactly I might be trying to persuade him about. The problem, both there and in my current article about the *Areopagitica*, is not what the reader ought to conclude about freedom of speech, but that of the relation between the little models we work out in our precious heads and our "policy recommendations," as also that of the kind of criticism a model ought to be subjected to before one even thinks of resting policy recommendations upon it. The Review article, though I am quite content with it, in some respects, for the purpose for which it was intended, is probably not for your eyes—even if (I deliberately scramble my metaphor) the 1st version was written, as I always write now, with you peering over my shoulder. Probably not the "Milton" either, though it would interest me greatly to know whether you think my use—and close-reading—of the Euripides tag comes off. (Incidentally, I have seen, and much admire Berns' piece on Milton.)

3) I have me a malady, which will oblige me to spend several weeks in a hospital come autumn. I shall go for that purpose, back to Madrid.

The thought of you at the Leisure of the Theory Class quite beggars the imagination—like, to repeat an old joke, that of Savonarola robbing a merchant's till. You have not told me whether you are to be there for a year, or only for the Summer—I greatly hope, for my lad Shrock's sake, only for the Summer.

Speaking of Shrock, I face this problem as regards the Reim sponsorships, about which I shall need your advice in due course: As I have told you, I see for myself no role in graduate instruction in the years ahead other than that of rescuing from the Yale behaviorists an occasional student of great promise who may just happen to turn up—by routing them to Chicago or, as seems indicated with some at least of my co-religionaries, to Notre Dame. The Reim sponsorships are, of course, extremely valuable for that purpose. Now: it had not occurred to me, when I sponsored Shrock, that a man with a law degree and a year of graduate training in a reasonably respectable department would require funds for longer than two years. Shrock, however, tells me that he cannot conceivably finish in two years, which poses not only the problem whether to recommend him a third time to Reim, which I shall not attempt to decide until I know something from

you of his performance, but also the more frightening problem: Must I, in general, if I send a man at the end of a year's graduate study to Chicago, be able to see ahead of him as much as three years financing—which as these sums go seems to me to be much more difficult, by comparison with two, than two by comparison with one! Might I have a word from you about this?

I continue here until 1 September, perhaps until 15 September—the decision is not mine but the landlady's; then Hossegor until 1 October; then Madrid again.

Rousseau writes in Chapter Two of the *Considérations*:

"Si Romulus n'eût fait qu'assembler des brigands qu'un réverser pouvait dispenser, son ouvrage imparfait n'eût pu résister au temps. Ce fut Numa qui le rendit solide. . ."

The first sentence clearly implies the opposite of what it is intended to say, namely that Romulus did nothing more; i.e. the protasis won't do. Would you agree with me that it is exactly the kind of mistake one would not expect J.J.R. to make in French.

Cordially,
Willmoore

P.S. Do you know of anyone who has gone behind the Poland to Wielhorski? I am ashamed to say I had not known until now that two other "French" political theorists, Mercier de la Rivière and Mably, were invited to write on Poland at the same time J.J.R. was.²¹

* * *

August 21, 1960
Professor Willmoore Kendall
8 chemin Scribe
Meudon-Bellevue
Seine/ France

Dear Willmoore,

I was very happy to hear from you and glad to see that your work progresses. I am not surprised about your observations regarding the Poland, not because I have made these observations myself but "once a hillbilly always a hillbilly," i.e. once a man writes in the forgotten manner he is likely to do it always. That you found "no secondary literature that treats it as in any way problematic" is I believe true of practically all secondary literature on every subject, as Swift noted when

he described the reaction of the commentators to Homer and Aristotle in the third part of *Gulliver*.

I was very happy to see that Mansfield has accepted your essay on the open society. Your reflections on the sinister machinations of your and my ill-wishers makes sense but as you say it is gratifying to see that their power is so limited.

You must not have any hesitation about sending me any of your studies printed or typed. Must I repeat that you are practically the only American-born of your generation who knows the meaning of political theory? As for the Center, I cannot say anything about it yet because last year's crop has left and next year's crop with the exception of Martin Diamond and myself is not yet in. I hope that a year without teaching will enable me to acquire some fat which I can then slowly dispense in my classes afterward. As regards Schrock, I have a very high regard for him: he is very intelligent and very assiduous. For his last paper I gave him an A+ which I believe never has happened before. Help him as much as you can and if my recommendation [sic] is required just tell me. As for your general question (the possible need for three years' financing) I can only say that what is not possible is not possible, but two years' study in theory where at least half of the time has to be deducted for the study of other branches of political science is damned little. The sentence from Rousseau's *Considérations* (or is this a slip for Montesquieu?) regarding Romulus and Numa surely has to be read as you read it.

Cordially yours,
Leo Strauss

P.S. I am scheduled to spend here a whole academic year 1960-61.

* * *

Meudon-Bellevue
29 August, 1960
But as from:
Poste Restante
Hossegor, Landes

Dear L.S.

You see that I am promoting—or demoting—you after all, to the designation by which you sign yourself (and the one I always use in my notes).

I shall not inflict the details upon you at this time (though I can imagine your sometime wishing to have a look at the relevant correspondence), but my diffi-

culties at APSR are by no means over. In accepting the article (on, he stressed, his personal responsibility), Mansfield had, let me in fairness say to begin with, made the acceptance conditional on some editorial changes that he wished to make in the "interest of my reputation for objectivity," and I had responded, thinking I knew what kind of thing he had in mind, that I was sure there would be no difficulty about that, as I believed sincerely there would not. But I was appalled when I received the actual "suggestions," some of which, to be sure, were well-founded over against the criterion he had established and were, therefore, readily acceptable, but most of which were predicted on the (for me rather surprising) premise that the purpose of the article is to persuade the Liberals to accept some "position" of mine, so that I must not say anything that will disturb them—nay, that will lose me an opportunity to ingratiate myself with them. And there is a second kind of suggestion, which I find almost equally disturbing: this, that, and the other must go out because it is "rhetoric," where I am unable even to begin to fathom what Mansfield understands himself to mean by "rhetoric." (I am not being disingenuous: I know that rhetoric, or rather a lazy tendency to rely on it for certain purposes, is one of my weaknesses; I do not like it; I like to think that I am grateful when someone calls my attention to a new manifestation of it.) E.g., there is a series of sentences (Mill, hardly less than Machiavelli, is a teacher of evil . . . Mill, hardly less than Machiavelli, accepts the authority of no previous writer, etc.), each of which makes a quite separate and distinct point. Mansfield wishes them to go out because their accumulation is "rhetorical." Or again: there is a section of the article in which I take up one objection to the Mill "model," justify it, or if you like support it, then waive it to pass on to another; each of the waive's objections, or rather the waiving of it, becomes a premise of the discussion of the next objection, and I list, at each point, the accumulated waived objections; this also Mansfield finds "rhetorical," though my purpose is certainly to assist the reader to carry in his mind what becomes a fairly heavy burden of premises.

Finally, there is a section (in which I speak of "those strategic situations in our national life that are dominated by Mill's epigones," and point out that those situations are characterized by a conspicuous uniformity of opinion on the important questions, and by a certain ruthlessness in the silencing of objectors) that must go out on the grounds: these statements are clearly intended to be "empirical"; you do not support them with empirical evidence, and could not support them satisfactorily; they cannot be supported by illustrations, because there would always be other illustrations on the other side; all must go. Suffice it to say that acceptance of the whole lot of suggestions would have left me with an article less mine than Mansfield's.

I am not, as I trust you agree, in position—unless I am just to give up on what-ever struggle it is I am engaged in in Yale—to do what I am sure you would have done, namely, to withdraw the article. My good friends and colleagues at Yale made much, two years ago when the question of my promotion was up, of the fact (probably correct) that I have never put anything comparable to my Locke book up on the shelf beside my Locke book, and of the fact that my name has been conspicuously absent from the major professional journals; I cannot lightly pass up an opportunity to publish something in the APSR—even when, as in this case, I am without confidence in their bona fides, I must meet the objections at Yale as they arise, up to that moment when the Department will be obliged to come out with the real objection. On the other hand, it is preposterous for me to publish an article that fails to say what it was intended to say, so that I could not in good conscience, or any conscience at all, just accept all the suggestions. So I did the only other thing that seemed possible in the circumstances, which was to undertake to discuss them, one at a time, though I would not bet that the result will necessarily be different from that which I would have achieved by withdrawing the article (Mansfield must be gravely sorry, by now, that he ever laid eyes on it, and there is obviously nothing to prevent his just tossing it back in my lap). I am particularly pessimistic about the possibility of convincing him that the purpose of the article, however clumsily it may be executed, is theoretical not tendentious (save in the sense that theory is always tendentious on certain matters), that I am not trying to win "converts" to the "closed society," which in my own view I am far less committed to than are Mill's epigones: my thesis is that the Mill proposal for public policy, fantastic on the face of it from the standpoint of the tradition in political theory, simply cannot be supported on Mill's grounds (which are *pas serieux*), and that Mill's grounds cannot be used to support any proposal that is less fantastic (Mill without tears), because Mill is quite correct in thinking that his arguments lead to precisely his proposal. Such a thesis, I am sure you will agree, can be advanced and argued, vigorously even, without concrete political objectives (in the meaning of the term political Mansfield would have in mind), and I honestly believe I do so argue it in the article. All I can do is beg that he try to read the article as something other than egg-head McCarthyism (though I am not so naive as to suppose that I can have my NR connection and not pay for it now and then). On the other points, I am perhaps less firm in the letter, but more vigorous, as I insist that the criteria he applies would result automatically in a situation in which no chapter of Aristotle's *Politics* could be published in the APSR; that the issue between what he calls empiricism in political science and whatever the hell he would call anti-empiricism in political science is the big issue in political science today, so that nobody has any business acting

as if it had already been decided; that the "rules" in political theory are precisely *not* those of the Yale Political Science department, which would not accept the proposition that there are Mill epigones unless it were statistically supported: that the political theorist must begin from what he supposes himself to observe in the political life about him; that if you keep him from taking that as his *point de depart*, demand that he not set it down because somebody might say he disagrees with it, you strike at, in LS's phrase, the very possibility of political theory; and, finally, that the question whether something is rhetorical or not is a question not of opinion but of fact. (I found myself arguing, by the way, though I had never before had occasion to put it that way before, that the criterion the political theorist must use as he reports on political reality is not whether he had in hand "proofs" with which to damn the doubters (without, if you please, mussing a shirt-cuff), but whether he supposes the statements he makes can, if subsequently challenged, be defended without one's making a fool of oneself); and that, in any case, if they are not set down, so that they can be discussed, we are not likely to get much farther with grasping political reality. Which is why those who apply rigorously "empirical" criteria never seem to learn anything about it, or rather, seem never to learn anything about it.

Unless I have already bored you to death with the matter, I shall keep you advised as to how this develops: I do believe it raises issues far broader and more important than the destiny of my own poor little piece.

No, the passage is indeed from Rousseau: It reads: "Ceux qui n'ont vu dans Numa qu'un instituteur de rites et cérémonies religieuses ont bien mal jugé ce grand homme. Numa fut le vrai fondateur de Rome. Si Romulus n'eût fait qu'assembler des brigands qu'un revers pouvait disperser, son ouvrage imparfait n'eût pu résister au temps. Ce fut Numa qui le rendit solide et durable en unissant ces brigands en un corps indissoluble, en les transformant en citoyens, moins par des lois . . . que par des institutions douces que les attachaient les uns aux autres. . . ."

I suppose you know, apropos of one statement in the foregoing, that I'd rather have your recent letter in which you speak of my *Locke* than the Yale professorship. Though there is at least one respect in which you do me far too much honor: I am not, really, American-trained, though I went to school in America for a long time before receiving what training I possess. I came to politics and economics from languages and literature at age 23, unspoiled by a previous flirtation, and under the tutelage of the late R.G. Collingwood, whose influence continues to weigh very heavily upon me. It might amuse you to know that Dave Riesman (of all people), in writing the most favorable of the few reviews the book received (I am fairly certain that the copies sent to European journals must of gone on a ship sunk by the Germans), described it as a book that sounded as if it had been

written not by an American but by a European. I have not looked at the review in many years, and I must: it would be interesting to see what Riesman thought he liked about the book.

I am much amused by your "once a hillbilly, etc." I hope you would agree to an extension of your remark, namely: once a man has indulged in exposing the forgotten kind of writing, he is likely to practice it himself. If not, I am wasting a lot of time on your *Machiavelli*.

Cordially,
Willmoore

P.S. You might wish to know that Bertrand de Jouvenel is spending the first semester of this year at Berkeley. And I am sure you already know that Voegelin is to spend the same months at Notre Dame.

* * *

September 28, 1960
Poste Restante
Hossegor
Landes, France

Dear Willmoore,

You must not be surprised at the seeming unkindness of Mansfield. It is only a part of the noble hypocrisy of academic life or of scholarship in general to assert that all positions have in fact the same right to be heard. Things are not different in scholarship than they are in political life. There is always a higher right of the first occupier or of the establishment. One must take this with good humor and then one will have more pleasant than unpleasant surprises.

Regarding the question at hand let us hope that Mansfield will be swayed by your argument. If not, you might have to think of another journal. I would not be surprised if Hallowell²² (*Journal of Politics*) would be more favorably disposed to your position. I just learned that he solicited Cropsey's APSA paper which was so extremely "non-empirical" that I myself got frightened. It is certainly a disgrace that this fellow MacCloskey's article on conservatism which was manifestly idiotic could make the grade at the APSR. By the way, I am no longer a member of the editorial board. I believe that if Jaffa were not at Ohio State I would never have published anything in the APSR. My impression formerly was that I could not publish anything in any journal where I was not practically the

editor (hence almost all my publications in Social Research) The passage from Rousseau which you quote clearly says that political society must have a religious foundation. Is this the point you were trying to make?

It was of the utmost interest for me to know that you were "tutored" by Collingwood. I have very high regard for Collingwood. He is the only 20th century Anglo Saxon known to me who was a genuine philosopher. I did not know this until I read his Autobiography, his *Idea of History* having disappointed me and his other writings being still unknown to me. I did look at his *New Leviathan* which I found low class war literature. I am sure he was mad. His deepest motivation, radicalized beyond recognition, and carried through with a much greater intellectual power, leads to Heidegger. I repeat, he was a very respectable man and there is of course no one in England who can dream of filling his shoes.

As ever yours,
Leo Strauss

* * *

Pinar, 21
Madrid
12 October 1960

Dear LS,

Thank you, as always, for your good letter of 28 September. I have been laid up, with a series of abscesses *sur le derrière* that made the days quite miserable for me.

I haven't a guess as to the outcome of the Mansfield matter: he finally answered my letter, saying that he had taken my "points" into account before bundling the article off to the printer's. I am to get my first glimpse of what I have written when I receive the galleys. Mansfield says he mainly struck out things "that would appeal exclusively to the Catholics and the natural-law people," and I have, imprudently perhaps, asked him whether we mightn't begin to apply the same principle to that which appeals exclusively to non-Catholics and anti-natural-law people, though I dare say that idea will not appeal to him much. You are right, of course, about the explanation, and the need for recognizing the prerogatives of the first occupier (though it is important to remember how recent is the right, in America, of *these* first-occupiers). I fear Hallowell is no solution for my problem: he operates under a sort of quiet understanding that one article from one man in two years is all he can handle. I personally am very glad HJ per-

sued you to publish some in the *Review*: your doing so has done all of us good; I would even have wished you to remain on the Board.

I am delighted that you think so highly of Collingwood; I think he was a very great man, and might have hoped you would have better things to say of the first 200 pp. of *New Leviathan*. He was undoubtedly off his rocker (he died a miserable death, from the continued rupturing of cells in his brain) by the time he came to the Kingdom of Darkness. He did view Heidegger with a certain sympathy and, curiously, Freud as well. He was, as you can imagine, much hated by the Oxford philosophers of his day, whom he always ridiculed for saying badly that which is not, and apparently the only Englishmen to whom he felt close, intellectually and spiritually, were Bradley and Alexander.²³ He despised the egalitarianization of Oxford, which is of course what finished off British philosophy.

Cordially,
Willmoore

P.S. Have you made any advanced behavioral studies yet? But of course you have, and I can guess of whom.

* * *

Pinar, 21
Madrid
17 Oct. 1960

Dear LS,

I probably ought to have better sense, since I desire your good opinion, than to show you the enclosed. I ought to have had better sense than to attempt such an article. It is an encyclopedia article on "Social Contract," which I had agreed to do, more than a year ago, before I had begun to grasp the implications of NRH with respect to the whole problem (and thus the deficiencies of such a work as Gough's),²⁴ and had not expected it to be much of a chore; to put it otherwise, the article I must have intended to write would have been downright misleading, and by the time I saw the kind of thing it must say, it was too late to get out of it. Collier shoots, incidentally, for the junior college level of students, and if you consent to read it you must bear that in mind as you do so.

I send it to you because a) if I don't show it to you, someone else might, and b) because it is so openly an attempt at *NRH-without tears* that, if you feel it should be withdrawn because of its inadequacies, I would wish to withdraw it and

November 17, 1960
 Professor Willmoore Kendall
 Pinar 21
 Madrid
 Spain

Dear Willmoore,

I thank you very much for your article on Milton which I enjoyed reading. It is a forceful and convincing statement. You naturally had in mind, although you did not refer to it because you wanted to give nothing but an interpretation of the *Areopagitica*—the *Easy and Ready Way* which shows how remote Milton was from any egalitarianism. I assume that we agree regarding the defect of Milton about which you were deliberately silent in the present context—if the argument of the *Areopagitica* were sound all children would have to be brought up in brothels in order to get the full exposure to vice required for becoming virtuous.

I was glad to hear that the Encyclopedia editors are in agreement with my judgment on your "Social Contract." Mansfield's generosity toward you does not surprise me. I have never met him, but the rejection letters which he sent me while I was on the editorial board impressed me because of their high quality. I also got an impression of him through Jaffa's reports and through his son²⁶ who is now Assistant Professor at Berkeley and who participates in a small private seminar we are having here once a week. You must have misunderstood me: I was not about to read the first three volumes of Voegelin's work but I shall read them as soon as I can. I do plan to write a review article of the whole work when it is out and as soon as I am through with my more pressing commitments. These commitments are 1) the editing of a history of political philosophy, the contributors to which are almost all former students of mine 2) an epilogue to four essays of criticism of scientific political science (Bentley, Lasswell, Herbert Simon and the voting studies) 3) a book on Aristophanes and Socrates 4) the Page Barbour lectures of Spring 1962 on "Principles of Classical Politics." In preparing 4) I will probably read volume II of Voegelin's work. You see that I am over-committed or over-extended especially considering the debility of my frame.

Cordially yours,
 Leo Strauss

c) because there is still time to correct it some, should you feel that less-than-major changes could improve it any. In no circumstances would I wish you to give any amount of time to it.

You will perhaps read it more charitably if you will visualize the summary-of-Sabine article they would have carried had I not taken the job on. I do see something to be said for seizing upon opportunities to get a different point of view into the encyclopedias. The question, which I am too close to it to try to answer, is whether I've made an unpardonable mess of it.

Could I have a word from you about it? Unless for your own marginalia, if any, don't bother to return the M.S.

Cordially,
 Willmoore

October 29, 1960
 Professor Willmoore Kendall
 Pinar, 21
 Madrid, Spain

Dear Willmoore,

I read your statement on the social contract. I admire your clarity and facility. Here are my observations, most of which are trivial.

p.2 bottom-p.3 top: Hobbes etc. cannot well be used for explaining the Covenant between God and Israel.

p.3: as for the Covenant in the Bible, this is based on the view of God expressed in Exodus, which literally translated means "I shall be what I shall be" (not "I am what I am"). God is bound not by His essence but by His free promises.

p.4 para. 2 end: "Dialogues" not in italics because not a book title.

p.8 line 3: do not put the "the" in quotes.

p. 13 para. 3 ad 3: the obligation to fulfill the contract is a *natural law* obligation in Hobbes and Locke.

Hoping to hear from you soon.

As ever yours,
 Leo Strauss

P.S. The Free Press has brought out Bloom's²⁵ translation of the letter to D'Alembert. I am sure they will send you a copy (review?) if you write to them (119 W. Lake Street, Chicago, Illinois).

December 27, 1960
 Professor Willmoore Kendall
 Pinar 21
 Madrid, Spain

Dear Willmoore:

I had already seen from the *National Review* that you had been ill and then your letter of November 21 gave me the details. I hope that you have by now perfectly recovered.

Things were also difficult at my end since my wife is not well and it took us a very long time to find the right kind of doctor and dentist. I am obliged to you for sending the Spanish version of the Socrates lecture. I tried to read it but my Spanish was too poor. I will try to get a copy of the English version in *Modern Age* as soon as possible.

I am still continuing my work on Aristophanes and am making slow but steady progress. Let me know how you are and what you are doing.

Cordially yours,

Leo Strauss

* * *

[May 10, 1961]

Dear L.S.,

I like to think you will have assumed these weeks, sight-unseen, that I have had urgent personal reasons for remaining silent. At last I can tell you what they are:

On Monday of this week I resigned from my tenure post at Yale University in return for a financial settlement which, though it lets Yale off cheaper than it should have been let off, is satisfactory to me. Opinions will presumably differ as to whether I was forced out, that is, as to whether the alternative open to me (an \$8,500 wage and flat notice that I was in no circumstances, ever, to be promoted to the exalted rank of full professor) was tolerable—if it was, then I certainly was not forced out. On the other hand, and between ourselves, those were not the primary considerations that prompted me to propose the transaction I have now completed: Financially, I happen not to be starveable: as witness my having survived up to now; and I had at last hit upon a strategy that I believe would, whatever the University's and department's wishes and intentions, have forced my promotion within two or three years (though I might be wrong about that). My real

reason was that I was at last sick to the death of the whole business, of the dishonesty and injustice with which I had been treated, of the degradation and consequent illegitimacy (your phrase) of the department, or if you like the moral and intellectual stench that emanates from the whole university, concerned at last just never to come near it again. My further real reason: I, more than most men, need a university to work in and for, in the sense that I can ill afford to be without a lively dialogue with my environment, and here I couldn't beat Yale's game: with the totalitarian completeness characteristic of situations dominated by our Liberal playmates, Yale closed up on Kendall many years ago (besides which, of course, there is no-one on the Yale horizon remotely interested in political philosophy—unless Charles Hendel, and if you know his work on Rousseau you will perhaps share my doubts even about him; and, anyway, he was part of the closing up).

Do you understand why, having got myself into such a jam, I chose, once the crisis was on, not to communicate with you? I would often have given my right arm during those weeks, for your counsel, but it seemed too great a burden (I do assume that important interests common to the two of us were at stake; both the Yale beachhead in and of itself and the fact that the final disposition of the "Kendall problem" at Yale, which was a problem only because of the concerted attack on political philosophy, can hardly fail to have implications for our entire professional situation) to thrust upon you; nor was I willing to communicate with you and deceive you about my predicament. The more since it was a miserable business, and I was quite miserable while it went on (e.g. at one time in the negotiations an agreement was reached, sufficiently formal to have served as the basis of a successful suit on my part, or so my lawyer assures me; the university then repudiated that agreement, offering me instead a less favorable one, and forcing upon me the disagreeable choice between accepting it by their fiat, and litigating.

Me voilà, then, at age 52, with so far as I know not the remotest prospect of employment in my chosen profession at any university in my native land, and not even, I fear, much the wiser for the experience: I have felt for many years like the protagonist of a Kafka novel, and even now feel differently only in the sense that I have cut through the "tangled web" of *The Trial* to a kind of freedom.

You must not, I hasten to say, waste any sympathy on me, not if you like because I don't deserve some but because I do not stand in need of it: I have been ill-used, but because of my extremely high "survival value" I am not much the worse for it: I am left the equivalent, given the modesty of my demands, independently "wealthy," which in the absence of the Yale settlement I could never have been: there is nothing to prevent me from settling down with my books for the rest of my days, without further thought of a job, and this even if, as I believe

they soon will, the canonical courts free me to remarry and create a family. 2). I am even better off than that: I am offered, and shall probably accept a year hence, the chair of political philosophy at the Catholic University of Pamplona, in a warm and friendly environment, and with a wage *in pesetas* that, with certain prerequisites that accompany the chair, will afford me a real income far in excess of that which I can buy with my 8,500 Yale dollars. With the chair, moreover, goes responsibility for the political formation of the elite of the Opus Dei movement, to which, as you can imagine, I attach great importance, and the facilities for creating according to my own notions, what does not now exist, a literature of modern political philosophy in Spain, (there was always a certain absurdity in my helping to train future Washington bureaucrats and Wall Street lawyers at Yale). 3). While I would of course never have sought the life of a permanent expatriate, I am capable of living contentedly in this one remaining land in which neither Machiavelli nor the French Revolution has yet happened; well, if you like, contentedly enough. (You will not understand me to be laughing off the defeat, a stunning one, that I have sustained, or to be refusing to recognize it as just that. But my wounds will be better licked than, probably, it deserves for them to be.)

I am flying home on 10 June, and shall probably remain at Northford for a year, or until such time as I can improve and satisfactorily sell my beautiful house and land. (separation from which will be the second-greatest of my sorrows in my *vita nuova*; I made great sacrifices at one time to make them mine.) I greatly hope that we can meet soon after my return, for I have much, that including some matters of business, that I want to discuss with you, to say nothing of the pleasure of seeing you again—and “reporting in.”

There is one matter on which I should now like your advice. Yale has acted in this business most imprudently, in the sense that it is now highly vulnerable to attack on grounds of academic freedom. Pupils of mine, Buckley²⁷ of course especially, will wish to take it out of Yale's hide, and are strategically well-situated for doing so; which is to say that the Kendall case could well become the same kind of *cause célèbre* as the Walsh-Sweezy case at Harvard in 1936, only, of course, with the tables turned as regards Left and Right. They will not, on the other hand, act if I tell them not to. Dare I ask what your wishes, *pro bono publico*, would be about this!

Sincerely,
Willmoore

P.S. I should like you to know, on a quite personal level, since you must have heard talk in this area over the years, that I appear to have broken completely

a long-standing habit of over-indulgence in alcohol. Not, as we say in Oklahoma, a drip-drop for five months now! And no thirst! Surprisingly, once I set my mind to it, it proved quite easy.

* * *

May 14, 1961
Professor Willmoore Kendall
Residenza
Pinar 21
Madrid 6
Spain

Dear Willmoore:

I have frequently wondered why I did not hear from you but there were always so many distractions which prevented me from writing to you to find out. Yesterday I received your letter. It made me very sad, not only for you but above all for the future of political theory in this country. For I have no doubt that the foot of your troubles is the enmity of the department at Yale to anything which is not “behavioralistic.” I was approached by Dahl both indirectly and directly with a request to recommend to them a young man trained by me in theory. I recommended the best one available but when he began to become interested he found out that he would have no future there: apparently they still bow to the convention that one must throw a bone of theory to the puppies but not a step beyond that. I myself feel very sad for two reasons: first, that I see no way in which I could help you; secondly, I am mortified by the fact that I, a fairly recent immigrant, could get a job as a full professor of theory whereas you, the best native theorist of your generation, have the fate of a political refugee without the consolations of a political refugee. I do not know what advice I would have given if you had asked me, but this is now water over the dam. As for the action possible now, i.e. raising the question of academic freedom, I am all for it if there is a serious prospect, I do not say of success, but of making any imprint. In this connection I would be very anxious to know how far Walter Berns could go in supporting your judgment, not on the intellectual and moral qualities of the department at Yale (for there is no question in my mind regarding that) but regarding a definite policy on their part to kill everything non-behavioristic. You must also be prepared that as good liberals they will act in a perfectly “value free” manner, i.e. not hesitate to use any pieces of mud within their reach. In a word, the case must

be well prepared and be put on the broadest basis so that it does not appear to be merely an affair of the *National Review* people. Could you expect any support from professors now at Yale in any department of the Social Sciences or the Humanities?

I shall be very happy to see you. But let me know as soon as possible when you plan to visit me. My present plan is to stay here in Stamford until early in July. But this plan is subject to change, so to say, at any time.

Cordially yours,
Leo Strauss

Pinar. 21
Madrid, Spain
22 May 1961

Dear L.S.,

I write about two matters of business, and not in response to your kind and generous letter of recent date, except to say "Thank you" for it.

(It wants a fairly extended reply, and that must wait for two or three days.)

a) I have agreed to select for publication in *Estudios Políticos* here, one for each of their six issues each year, articles calculated to get across to Spanish students of politics what of importance is going on in American political science. Mainly, I hope to choose things that might help head off here the descent into the behavioral chasm, and I shall wish to talk with you in Chicago (or Michigan?) about how much of the forthcoming book by your students might be used in *Estudios Políticos* for that purpose. But I have the further purpose, as you know from earlier correspondence, of bringing your work to the attention of our Spanish colleagues, and I should therefore like them to carry the Jerusalem lecture at an early date. Could I have your permission for them to use it, and dare I ask you to speak to the Free Press about it.

b) *Estudios Políticos* is the house-organ of the Instituto de Estudios Políticos, of which let me say at once that it is in surprisingly good hands. It has far greater resources than the house (Rialp, which is in the best of hands) with which I have been expecting to publish your *Machiavelli*, which project has lagged because Rialp simply cannot pay a translator to do the kind of work that we must insist on and, at the same time, meet the publishing costs for so large a book. I propose, therefore, to switch the *Machiavelli* to *Estudios Políticos*, the Institute, that is,

which *can* afford to pay the remarkable woman who has just done my Locke, and am writing to Free Press to ask their blessing about this change of plans. At the same time, however, I propose to commit Rialp to doing *NRH*, a far less expensive publishing venture, and myself to pay the difference between Rialp's fee for translation and that which will be necessary in order to get a first-class job. If that meets with your approval, dare I, here too, ask for your help with the publishers?

I shall myself check each word of each of the three translations, as I have just done with my *Locke*, for accuracy and elegance. As a labor of love and, of course, because I shall need the books for my students at Pamplona if I am to go there a year hence.

Again a letter of yours came through from California in less than three days! Any reply to the present letter likely to reach Europe later than 3 June should go to me at my old Paris address, Hotel Montpensier 12, Rue de Richelieu Paris 1

Cordially,
Willmoore

P.S. I am also going to select articles for *Politica Internacional*, another Institute publication, and had hoped to use Berns' "World Government." He is, however, unwilling to ask Oxford for permission, and does not say why—surely not because of nervousness about being published in Franco, Spain? But, if not that, what then?

May 27, 1961
Professor Willmoore Kendall
Pinar 21
Madrid, Spain

Dear Willmoore:

Our critique of behaviorist political science will be published by Holt in the Spring of 1962. I suppose you could get a copy of the manuscript by writing to the editor, Professor Herbert Storing, Department of Political Science, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Illinois. I wrote the epilogue (about 30 typewritten pages) of which I shall send a copy to your Paris address within a few days. You have my permission to use anything of my publications. I will ask the Free Press for their agreement. I will also ask the Free Press regarding the switch from RIALP to the *Political Studies*. I hate the thought of your paying anything

toward the translation of *NR&H*. I remember that the Italian translation was made with the financial help of some organ of the U.S. government but unfortunately I do not have a copy of the Italian translation here and therefore I cannot say anything more about it. It is awfully kind of you to take so much trouble with the translation of my things. I am sure that Walter Berns is not influenced by any fear about being published in Franco Spain. I will try to find out the reason and let you know, perhaps when we meet in this country. With best wishes,

As ever yours,
Leo Strauss

* * *

July 6, 1961

Professor Willmoore Kendall
Hotel Montpensier
12 rue de Richelieu
Paris 1e, France

Dear Willmoore:

The "literary agency" ACER in Madrid asks me whether the Spanish language rights of *Natural Right and History* are still free, for they would like to get an option on the book. Do you know anything about the agency and about any arrangements we have made regarding a Spanish translation? I would be grateful for a reply.

Since you did not turn up here I suppose you have changed your plans. As for me, I plan to leave here on July 17 and to be back in Chicago on July 19.

As ever yours,
Leo Strauss

October 5, 1961

Mr. Willmoore Kendall
Northford, Conn.

Dear Willmoore,

I took care of your Fulbright program. I wish you the best of luck.

Sincerely yours,
Leo Strauss
LS:mf

* * *

March 23, 1962

Professor Willmoore Kendall
Northford, Connecticut

Dear Willmoore:

I was glad to hear from you and so much more satisfactory news about you than I had for sometime.

Can you refresh my memory as to what precisely you mean regarding "What is Political Philosophy?": The article or the book, so that I can contact the publisher.

As ever yours,
Leo Strauss
LS:ef

April 30, 1962
 Professor Willmoore Kendall
 Forest Road
 Northford, Connecticut

Dear Willmoore:

I just received the permission of the Macmillan Company for *Estudios Políticos* to bring out "for one time use only" the title essay of *What is Political Philosophy?*

Rumor has it that you have been here on the campus. I cannot say how much I deplore not having seen you.

As ever yours,
 Leo Strauss
 LS:ef

* * *

10 May 1962

Dear L.S.,

Actually, I was only on the Chicago campus only from eight o'clock in the evening on, and that sandwiched between speaking engagements in Evanston that afternoon and in Indianapolis the following noon—all, moreover, en route to a series of such engagements in California. The visit I should so much have liked to have with you was, therefore, simply out of the question, and you may, believe me, depend upon it that Willmoore Kendall misses no opportunities to see Leo Strauss. (At most he is open to the charge of not having created such an opportunity, and that there is something to, which we may put as follows: WK, eminently displeased with himself after his two years abroad, has been reluctant to be seen, especially by LS until he has justified his existence by finishing anyhow one of his current projects—may, indeed, for that reason go off to Europe once again, for the Summer, without letting himself be seen. This though there is much to report, and much also that he would like to ask some questions about.)

At least this much of what there has been to report should, however, have been communicated to you long before this: By February, when I went to Georgetown to teach the second semester, and especially by March, when I had accepted a new post at Los Angeles State College, the anxieties about the future that had dictated my long letter to you from Madrid (about Pamplona, etc.) had been set at rest; I have been able to work, since, with a kind of freedom and

(I like to think) clear-headedness that I have not known for many years; so that by the end of the year I should have not less than three long overdue volumes in the hands of the publishers and be well into a fourth (my new "go" at Locke). Add to that, also for the first time in many years, I have been enjoying work, as a man suddenly restored to good health after a long illness enjoys his well-being, and that I have, in consequences, been quite greedy about it—14-15 hours daily at my desk, to bed off at the end with feelings of some satisfaction about the day's accomplishment. I know you will be pleased at this.

The new part, as you will have heard, is at one of the new state colleges in California—a considerable come-down from Yale, my not-so-well-wishers will say, but one that I am not the least displeased about: along with comparatively light teaching load and rather more money than so unimaginative a man will know what to do with, it will offer me my first opportunity to teach in largely congenial surroundings—indeed my appointment there is owing to a claque of Kendall admirers or at least buffs that, again not wholly by accident, has built up there over the years, so that I go there with the feeling of having completed a long and disagreeable journey to a place filled with delights. (*Inter alia*: my new colleagues are the most discursive group of political scientists I have ever met, and me.) I thrive on conversation, which as you perhaps know is a form of "behavior" that has virtually disappeared from the East Coast. I would not have believed, when I returned to the U.S. in June, that the Kendall story could have so happy an issue at so early a date.

I thought, until a couple of weeks ago, that I had you another Tom Schrock—quite the most brilliant pupil that has come my way in the past decade. But it turns out that his father's business gets him.

That is good. The word from Macmillan, the Strauss *Machiavelli* will go to the press in Madrid in the Autumn (The translation, as I believe I have told you, is magnificent, even down to capturing much of the tone of the English original). I do not go to Europe until the end of June.

Cordially,
 Willmoore

P.S. Von Hayek's²⁸ anarchists set upon and ravished me at Chicago! I am it seems, both a murderer and an inquisitor.

May 17, 1962

Professor Willmoore Kendall
Northford, Connecticut

Dear Willmoore:

I was very glad to see that you are again settled in your native country. I am looking forward to seeing and hearing much of your writing and teaching activity.

There is a high probability, unfortunately not yet a certainty, that Schrock will be my research assistant next year.

Did you receive a copy of *Essays on the Scientific Study of Politics*, edited by Herbert Storing, from the publisher (Holt-Rinehart)? I requested that he do this a long time ago, but he has been rather unreliable in these matters. Be so good as to let me know whether you received the book.

I was especially glad to hear that the college in California to which you go is so attractive to you. I wish you the best of luck.

Cordially yours,
Leo Strauss
LS:ap

* * *

August 2, 1962

Professor Willmoore Kendall
8, Chemin Scribe
Meudon-Bellvue
S & O
France

Dear Willmoore:

This is only to make assurance doubly sure. The South American publisher Huemul wants to bring out a Spanish edition of my *Natural Rights* book. Did you complete your negotiation with Rialp in Madrid? Be so good as to let me know so that I can reply to the South American.

With best wishes.
As ever yours,
Leo Strauss
LS:ef

August 27, 1962

Dear Willmoore,

On the basis of the data supplied by you I feel that it would be wisest to leave *Natural Right and History* in the hand of Rialp. I have no hurry and therefore I will not mind much if they are not in a hurry. The only Spaniard I ever knew was Don Fernando de los Rios, the last ambassador of the Spanish Republic in Washington. He was a wonderfully sweet man. One specimen: being a grandfather and now widowed he had the experience which enabled him to tell me one night when we were waiting for the subway: "American women are terrible; they ignore you after you have been intimate with them." He also told me that the Minister of Police in the last Republican administration of Spain was a member of the anarchist party. My formula for the Spaniards is that Don Quixote and Sancho Panza are as perfect expressions of the Spanish character as Sherlock Holmes and Dr. Watson are of the British character.

I shall not go to the APSA meeting and therefore I shall not be able to attend the *National Review* dinner. Hoping to see you in the near future.

As ever,
Yours,
L.S.

* * *

November 6, 1962

Professor Willmoore Kendall
530 South Normandie
Los Angeles 5, California

Dear Willmoore:

I was very happy to hear that you like it out there and not only because of the climate. Like Jeeves I am very happy to see that I can be of service to you. (You know of course Bertie Wooster's immortal companion.) The influence of Machiavelli on J.-J. is obvious: does he not refer to "men as they are" at the very beginning of the C.S. Hoping to hear from you very soon again.

As ever yours,
Leo Strauss
LS:ef

May 13, 1963

Professor Willmoore Kendall
1070 West Kensington Road
Los Angeles 26, California

Dear Willmoore:

This is only to thank you for your *Conservative Affirmation*.

I am very glad to have your essays and reviews of the last period together. I suppose that by now you will have received our fat *History*.²⁹ Is there any prospect of your coming to the Midwest, and especially to Chicago, in the foreseeable future?

As ever yours,
Leo Strauss
LS:ap

* * *

August 30, 1963

Professor Willmoore Kendall
1820 North Quinn
Arlington 9, Virginia

Dear Willmoore:

I shall be waiting for you on September 8-10. I am looking forward—in a great rush.

Cordially,
Leo Strauss
LS:ef

September 18, 1963

Dear Willmoore,

Dr. Laurence Berns, a former student of mine, tells me the following story: "I had a nice chat in Madrid with an intelligent lady who is translating *Thoughts on Machiavelli* into Spanish and promised her I would mention the following matter to you: following the injunction of W. Kendall, who checked the translation, she translated as literally as possible, sacrificing where necessary elegance of expression to accuracy. She would like to include a note to that effect, because, she says, if she doesn't, there are a few places where the readers will say that the translator doesn't know how to write Castellano. She wrote to Kendall about such a note and he never answered her. Apparently they need directions from above even for so minor a matter. She would be grateful for a note from you to Kendall or to herself. (Dña. Maria del Carmen Gutiérrez de Gamba, Recoletos 14, Madrid, Spain).

Since you know the lady and in fact are responsible for the translation being made, I believe that you would be the natural writer to her.

The present political scene makes me sick. I read in this morning's Chicago Sun Times (I do not have to tell you that I do not read the New York Times) that Heller³⁰ justifies the radical change in fiscal policy by the observation that the previous fiscal policy was based on the possibility of war and the belief that inflation is a danger (this is not literal, but the substance). This together with the test ban treaty is the perfect formula for the Kennedy policy. In spite of the idiocy of this policy I am sure that he will be re-elected because he is probably the cleverest politician now in the field and he knows that the majority of the American people do not wish to hear of unpleasant things. Otherwise Keating's³¹ disclosures would have been fatal to him. I know nothing of constitutional law but I cannot believe that "advice and consent of the Senate" means that the Senate can be confronted with a fait accompli like the test ban treaty: is there no possibility that some representatives of the foreign relations committee who are in the opposition must be called in for this kind of negotiations long before any treaty is initiated? What can one do to prevent the continuation of this administration? One little point has occurred to me, a point which cannot have wide popular appeal but might have some usefulness regarding the younger people, say the college population. My private formula for Kennedy and what he stands for is "image." Buckley with his great power of invective should write an article confronting the concept of image with that of "a decent respect for the opinion of mankind" and making clear that "image" is even lower than "an indecent respect for the opinion of mankind," for such an indecent respect might come from sheer fear which

is a much more decent motivation than the disgraceful delusionism now rampant in Washington. In 1951 or 52 Walter Lippman wrote a column demanding that the long rule of the democratic party must come to an end lest the festering dissatisfaction would lead to an outbreak of mad right wing extremism. I believe that one could use this argument properly restated against the re-election of Kennedy.

I was very sorry not to be able to see you on your way back to the southwest.

As ever,
Yours,
L.S.

* * *

December 3, 1963
Professor Willmoore Kendall
P.O. Box 1330
Dallas 21, Texas

Dear Willmoore:

To my very great regret I must disappoint you regarding both of your requests. After having considered all my students available today, I have come to see that there is not a single one who could be prevailed upon to come to Dallas for the next academic year. Those who will still be engaged in writing their Ph.D. theses during the next academic year and need financial support are likely to get fellowships not inferior in monetary value to the payment they would receive for their teaching at your institution; they would naturally prefer to have their whole time at their disposal for completing their theses. I come now to your request concerning Dahl. I have had a cursory acquaintance with Dahl's book and saw this much, that a thorough criticism of his thesis is badly needed. We had him on our list of objects of criticism for our essays on scientific politics. Martin Diamond was supposed to "do" him. But for one reason or another, he did not come around to doing the job. He would surely be much more competent than I am to judge your manuscript.³² The chief reason, however, why it would be hard for me to read the manuscript at this time is that I had another rather unpleasant warning regarding my body and have to take it very easy. I am very sorry that I cannot be of help to you in this matter. I do not have to tell you that I have not been consulted by the Press about your manuscript. The rules which they follow in soliciting comments escape my comprehension. It was understood that they would bring out my book on Machiavelli. But then I heard, through a minor indiscre-

tion, whom they wanted to approach as a judge on my book, whereupon I tacitly arranged through Edward Banfield³³ that the Free Press would bring it out.

As ever yours,
Leo Strauss

* * *

January 16, 1964
Professor Willmoore Kendall
University of Dallas
Box 1330
Dallas 21, Texas

Dear Willmoore:

I am sorry that I cannot help you. I have considered all possibilities and talked to the most likely among them, but I did not achieve anything. The reason is in a way gratifying. It is to be found in the high moral standards of the present generation of American students: they marry very early, and it is very hard to move a non-bachelor for a single year from Chicago to Dallas.

I repeat the expression of my regret.

Cordially yours,
Leo Strauss

* * *

February 3, 1964
Professor Willmoore Kendall
P.O. Box 1330
Dallas 21, Texas

Dear Willmoore:

If I signed my letter to you with my full name, this had no other reason, but only that I signed the letter in a very great rush together with many other letters. It surely had nothing to do with the difference of opinion we have regarding the placement of my students.

What I told you when we met about the difficulty of placing my students present or past, referred to people like Jaffa, who is stranded in Ohio State, or to

Bloom, who was saved from extinction only in the last minute by Walter Berns. Differently stated, qua my students teaching theory, they are lost men. Fortunately, most of them do not teach merely theory: they go out as U. of C. graduates without any emphasis on their having studied with me, and then they get jobs without difficulty either here in the College, like Schrock, or in the East or Midwest, like many others. It just has not happened since I am here that a B+ or better student did not get a three-years job after having since passed his preliminary examinations if he was eager to get a job. As matters stand now, there was only one student of whom I could think that he would be prepared to go to Dallas for one year. He is earning his living teaching here at a junior college. He is the father of three children, and he simply if politely refused to listen to my entreaties. I was glad to hear that your institution would pay the moving expenses, but you did not say that you would pay the moving expenses both ways; I should know this for the future.

I did not say that "getting married *suddenly* reflects a peculiarly high standard of morality," but that getting married fairly early does. I trust that I do not have to labor this point. As for the bad reputation of Chicago as a modern Babylon, this surely does not apply to the graduate faculty of the University of Chicago, and least of all to the Political Science Department, as everyone who knows that Department, faculty or students, would agree. I took cognizance with the greatest interest of what you told me about your plans re: Jaffa. I will keep them strictly secret.

I hope I succeeded in disposing of the misunderstanding which has arisen.

Cordially yours,
Leo Strauss

October 20, 1964
Professor Willmoore Kendall
Department of Politics and Economics
University of Dallas Station, Texas 75061

Dear Willmoore:

I am very sorry for my seeming lack of courtesy, but both I and my wife had great health troubles which considerably reduced my working capacity. I even decided to cancel my engagement to lecture in Hamburg during the Summer Semester, 1965.

As for your first question, I do not recall that Machiavelli ever speaks anywhere of natural law or natural right. He surely rejects it. This is implied in his adoption of "Polybius" in *Disc. I: 2*. I was silent about his silence on natural law as distinguished from the conscience, the soul, etc., because he speaks so emphatically about the conscience, the soul, etc., in his other writings while he does not do so regarding natural law. As for question 2, I do not know of anyone working on a decent translation of the *Disc*. There exists another translation by an English Jesuit, Walker, which is in some respects better than Detmold's³⁴ and in some respects worse; see my review in *Review of Metaphysics*, 1952, pp. 437 ff.

I am sorry, I seem to have mislaid your statement regarding the Social Contract tradition. I know that of Gierke, *Althusius* (the English translation does not carry Althusius in the title, but says something of "political theory"), and Gough,³⁵ who wrote that bad book on Locke, wrote a reasonably good book on the Social Contract tradition. The two books, especially Gierke's, are surely helpful for showing that the full-fledged traditional Social Contract theory was elaborated only a fairly short time before the break with the tradition by Hobbes. Could you send me another copy of your statement regarding your Encyclopedia article? Perhaps I can be of some help.

As ever yours,
Leo Strauss

October 29, 1964
Professor Willmoore Kendall
Department of Politics and Economics
University of Dallas Station, Texas 75061

Dear Willmoore:

I reread your essay on the social contract in your *Conservative Affirmation*. I fully agree with the main thesis of that essay. One notices the tactical disadvantage of a man who wishes to base conservatism on the Declaration of Independence and hence on Locke (cf. your book, 264, paragraph 1 end). From this point of view the *Federalist Papers*, based as they are on Montesquieu, are preferable, especially if one considers that they give the interpretation of the Constitution, and the D of I is not strictly speaking a constitutional document. (By this I do not wish to deny, of course, that the D of I carefully and soberly read is quite conservative.) The only point of your essay with which one could

find fault is the paragraph on pp. 94-95: what about Salomonius and the medieval pre-history of the *social contract* (as distinguished from the contract of the people with the government). One must not underrate the power of the clerical tendency to debase secular, i.e. royal power by ascribing to it a contractual origin, while these writers of course never dreamt of tracing the papal power to a contract. More important: your point is proved by the *sketchy* character of Mariana and Buchanan's statements (I was unable to look them up again now, so I speak from memory).³⁶ They do not even dream of attempting to revise the traditional doctrine of natural law; contrast this with Hobbes's *Epistle Dedicatory* to the *Elements of Law*. Needless to say that you understood of course perfectly the gist of *Natural Right and History*.

A dependable translation of the *Discorsi* would be a very great boon, I mean a translation which preserves the ambiguities of the text among other things. Did you ever see the translation of *Maimonides' Guide of the Perplexed* by Pines,³⁷ brought out by the University of Chicago press last year? The problem of translation is in both cases similar to the extent that both works are "bi-lingual," i.e. written in one language and containing quotations from a book written in another language (the Bible or Livy, respectively) and this is done with great art.

As ever yours,
Leo Strauss

November 3, 1964
Professor Willmoore Kendall
Department of Politics and Economics
University of Dallas Station, Texas 75061

Dear Willmoore:

I received the enclosed article yesterday, and I read it immediately. I have only two criticisms. Page 5: you italicize Plato's dialogues, but "dialogues" is surely not a book title. Page 21, line 3: "no higher law" in Locke is on the face of it, as no one knows better than you, contradicted by the *Civil Government*. I believe you should do something to protect yourself against what any ignoramus might hurl against you.

As ever yours,
Leo Strauss

11-24-64

Dear Willmoore!

I am at present (until December 11) at Davis (Calif., as a guest of the Dept. of Pol Sci.); hence I write by hand, hoping that you can read it. I received your review, TOM,³⁸ the day of my departure from Chicago. It has made me happy. There is out one review which is at least decent in form: by Butterfield in John Hallowell's *Journal*. Yours is the first which tells the profession that my interpretation must be taken seriously. I do not know how to thank you.

It goes without saying that you have understood . . . its essence perfectly. I can see you reading Machiavelli's clevernesses when you became aware of them exactly as I did: "I'll be darned."

My criticism: 1) p.7 end of the para—makes me blush 2) p.8 para 2 line 8—*"never* arguing goes too far; this effects. . . b lines 11-12; there is in both cases (S&M) some "refutation."

I know of a series with Butterfield, Hallowell (APJR), Morse (Chicago *Journal of History*), is a recent one (his [indecipherable] one by [indecipherable]; Butterfield's is the only respectable one.

I repeat the expression of my thanks.

Cordially yours,
L.S.

23 April 1965

Dear L.S.,

I follow up thus tardily on my phone-call for a very simple—but exasperating—reason: the President of the University of Dallas, with whom I had to speak before writing to you, has been incommunicado through three days. He finally "showed" late last night.

Plans are well advanced here for launching a graduate program in 1966-67. The program will not be a Ph.D. program in Political Science: I have become increasingly convinced, by your own work and that of your pupils, that what is now called for is a program in Politics and Literature, leading to a Ph.D. examination that would cover the Great Tradition in Political Philosophy and the Great Tradition in Literature, thus freeing the students from the obligation of dividing their time in graduate school between the important—"legitimate" (*your phrase*)—things and—I trust I don't step on your toes—such things as International Relations, Public Administration, Constitutional Law, Behavioral Politics, etc., about which

students well-trained in Political Philosophy can learn what they need if and when they need it. The plan up to now has been for students to take, on the Politics side, 2-3 quarters in Pre-Classical Political Philosophy, 2-3 quarters in Classical Political Philosophy, 2-3 in Modern Political Theory, 2-3 in American Political Theory, and 2-3 in World Communism. The other "side" of the program, as we conceive it, would consist of seminars in, say, The Tragedy, The Epic, The Modern Novel, English Poetry and the Bible, Theory of Literary Criticism, etc. I shall have strong support for all this from the Administration and from an increasingly strong English Department.

The program, as we conceive it, would have 2-3 perhaps unusual features: (a) It would run from November through August, so as to make it easier, in Summer at least, to attract "name" Visiting Professors (we can't hope to offer all of such a program with permanent appointments); e.g. Diamond and Jaffa for alternate Summers to teach the American courses, Wimsatt³⁹ from Yale for Theory of Literary Criticism, etc. (I have thought it just possible that you might be happier in such a program than in that of a "straight" Political Science Department.) (b) Students would continue course-work throughout their third year, beginning work on a dissertation at say half-way mark. (c) the foreign language requirements would be "serious," and rigidly enforced.

Funds for such a program would come from the interest on a 7 1/2 million grant the University received last year, of which we have hoped up to now to have 1/5—the rest going to Business Administration, Art and Science Engineering. Since last night's talk with the President I believe that with L.S. here we would receive a considerably larger share of that interest, perhaps 1/3.

If I am correctly informed about the salary being discussed at Claremont, we are thinking in terms of a rather larger sum—say \$18,000 any year you yourself would prefer to remain for the Summer, \$12,000 for two quarters (I think you might well prefer to go away for the Summer). Teaching load: one graduate seminar, of your own choosing of course. Of course the University of Dallas isn't Chicago, or even Claremont. But with you here, I believe we could attract fine students even to Dallas.

Does this sound interesting?

Cordially,
Willmoore

P.S. Are you aware that Duke has announced publication of a complete Translation of Machiavelli's works?⁴⁰

April 27, 1965

Dear Willmoore:

The administration of the U. of C. as well as all my former students with the natural exception of Diamond and Jaffa, and last but not least my physician persuaded me to stay here or rather not to make any change now. So this is settled. This does not detract from my sincere gratitude to you for the step, so honoring to me, which you have taken.

I received, read and reread your Locke paper. It is not only very intelligent but also very decent, for it is very hard to speak decently about one's own merits. You succeeded perfectly, and you put the accents most properly.

I entirely agree with what you suggest on page 23 bottom. There is no doubt some slight difference between us regarding Locke. To what you say on p.25 end of the paragraph I would reply by referring to *N.R.H.* 233-34 or more particularly: the electoral laws must consider not only numbers but wealth as well. As regards your statement on p. 36 line 8-9 I would say that my criticism of the right of self-preservation is directed against the claim that it is the sole or *the* fundamental right; I have no objection to describing it as a natural right provided one admits what Montesquieu says against Sir William Petty's attempt to establish the monetary value of a human being by the price he fetches on the slave market at Algiers: this is the price of an Englishman; there are countries where the price of a human being is much less, in some countries it is zero and in others even less than zero. As for Laslett's *edition*, Goldwin has told me that it suffers from very grave defects.⁴¹

I thank you again very profoundly for your paper on Locke—not the least for the practical-moral lesson you draw at its end. You are the only man who vindicates the honor of our profession.

As ever yours,
Leo Strauss

* * *

November 4, 1966

Dear Willmoore,

I was very happy to learn that your great difficulty had been overcome. My most cordial congratulations.

I agree with you that George Anastaplo would meet your requirements. While he is not a Catholic, he is at present doing some teaching at Rosary College, a small Catholic girls' college in a Chicago suburb. I do not know however whether he can be lured away from Chicago.

I am glad that my *Spinoza* is some help to you. The connection between Spinoza and Rousseau has often been pointed out, but not indeed regarding the civil religion. The most important of Rousseau's works regarding the relation to Spinoza would probably be the letters written from the mountain.

Apparently my publisher did not keep his promise to send you my most recent book, *Socrates and Aristophanes*. Let me know so that I can remind him of his duty.

My health is not too good. I had to spend again some time in the hospital. But I have begun to give my course and hitherto I have been able to keep it up. With best wishes,

As ever yours,
Leo Strauss

November 18, 1966
Dear Willmoore,

I was very sorry to hear of the troubles which you have with your health and with guiding your department. I wish I could be of help in the latter respect. The only man who meets your requirements (apart from having published anything) is Marvin Kendrick, at present Assistant Professor in the Department of Government at Yale. I think highly of him. He came to me from Duke, studied with me and at the same time in the Classics Department for a considerable number of years, was my research assistant for two or three years, has begun to study Arabic and is about to begin to study Hebrew, wrote his Ph.D. thesis (on Xenophon) under my supervision etc. I do not know whether he can be moved. He is a Protestant with a Southern background.

As for Rousseau's Letters written from the mountain, you might perhaps have a look at Karl Barth's *History of Protestant Theology* (from between 1760 and 1870), entitled in German *From Reimarus to Ritschl*, which is I believe available in English translation.

I shall ask my publisher to send you a copy of my new book. As ever yours,
Cordially,
Leo Strauss

June 2, 1967

Dear Willmoore,

I hasten to reply to your letters. I was very sorry to hear about your cardiac troubles. I hope you will be spared another thrombosis. In the meantime be a good boy and obey strictly your doctor. I am suffering from kindred troubles as you know, and this is an important factor why I am eager to go to Claremont: I am longing for a better physical and moral-political climate than that of Chicago.

It is hard for me to give you advice regarding your work on Rousseau, for you are now much deeper in JJ than I am. A perfectly elegant solution to your problem is I think impossible, for his case differs so greatly from that of Machiavelli who singled out the *Prince* and the *Discourses* as the books which contain everything he knows. JJ's case differs also greatly from those of Hobbes and Locke for similar reasons. If you were to limit yourself to things published by JJ, you would have to exclude the GP; on the other hand if you include all things completed by him, you would have to include *Perpetual Peace* and *Corsica*. As for the guideposts erected by him, I remember at the moment only his statement that the *Emile* is his most important book (in Rousseau *jugé de JJ*); I do not remember now what he says in the *Confessions on the Emile* and the CS. It makes sense to exclude the two early discourses since they are admittedly provisional; yet I believe that the statements on Hobbes in the second discourse (both in the preface, and in the first part where he appeals to Mandeville against Hobbes) should be included.

I did not know that Master's book was out.⁴² I knew of it since he has written me long letters about his agreements and disagreements with me. He is trying to achieve peace between me and the SS men and this would seem to show that he is more charitable than I.

When you come to JJ's religious writings, you should consider Karl Barth's *From Reimarus to Ritschl* which contains a competent chapter on JJ. Barth does not consider of course that JJ's "sincerity" was less than hundred per cent.

I reread a few days ago your forceful and noble article on "Locke Revisited." I am preparing a review of Abrams' edition etc. of Locke's early two tracts on inking he got through Cox remained sterile.

With repeated wishes for your health in which my wife joins me, I am
As ever yours,
Leo Strauss

1815 E. Grauwylor
#154

Irving, TX 75060
18 October 1970

Dear Professor Strauss:

I write to introduce myself (although I'm assuming you already know of my existence from, perhaps, Professors Diamond, Jaffa, or Anastaplo), and to ask, hopefully, if you will give your kind permission to my dedicating the soon-to-be-published Kendall translation of Rousseau's *Government of Poland* to you. (The book will be published around Christmas time in paperback form by Bobbs-Merrill.)

I worked closely with Willmoore for years before we were married in 1966, as secretary and research assistant, so I know well the extremely high regard in which he held you, personally and scholastically.

Willmoore was a passionately-driven man who looked to few men of his own time for inspiration or guidance, so his "happy discovery of Strauss" (his own words expressed often) gave much personal warmth and comfort and scholarly companionship to an often lonely spirit. I thank you Professor Strauss, for that.

It would please me so much if you would allow me to dedicate the *Poland* translation to you, sir.

I hope this finds you well.

Sincerely,
Nellie Kendall

* * *

786A Fair View Ave.
Annapolis, Maryland
October 28, 1970

Dear Mrs. Kendall,

I was deeply touched by your letter which, as it were, brought Willmoore for me again to life.

Of course I know of your existence (to use your expression), and I know how Willmoore thought of me. This made me very happy for I had and have the highest regard for his judgment. He was the only man who, without having been my student, understood marvelously what I thought and intended. I always had the

highest regard for his excellent, and therefore in the prevailing climate largely ignored, study on Locke.

I feel greatly honored by your wish to dedicate to me Willmoore's translation of Rousseau's *Government of Poland*.

I am very grateful to you for your letter.

Sincerely yours,
Leo Strauss

NOTES

1. "On the Intention of Rousseau" 14 *Social Research* (December 1947), 455-87. (New School For Social Research, now New School University).
2. William Volker, The Volker Foundation sponsored the Buck Hill Falls Lectures as part of a Conference on Democratic Theory in the spring of 1955.
3. Theodor Herzl (1860-1904).
4. Anne Brunsdale.
5. L. Brent Bozell, brother-in-law of William F. Buckley, Jr. also studied at Yale under Willmoore Kendall.
6. Published in *National Review*, late December 1956 or early January 1957.
7. Here and throughout these letters, JJ, J-J, GP, the Poland, and CS most likely refer to Jean-Jacques Rousseau, his *Government of Poland* and his *Social Contract*. NRH and NR&H refer to *Natural Right and History*.
8. This may refer to essays scheduled to have been delivered at Buck Hill Falls and published with other essays as *What is Political Philosophy?* (1959).
9. Richard A. Ware served as President (1969-1984) of the Reim Foundation, which was reorganized as the H. B. Earhart Foundation. The project of Robert H. Horwitz (1923-1987) and Martin Diamond (1919-1977) seems to have been published in 1962 as *Essays On the Scientific Study of Politics* ed. Herbert J. Storing (1928-1977).
10. Arthur F. Bentley (1870-1957); Pendleton Herring, president of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation and former president of the American Political Science Association; David B. Truman, former president of the American Political Science Association.
11. Walter Berns, University Professor of Government, Emeritus Georgetown University. During the period of these letters, he was a member of the Department of Political Science, Yale University.
12. Heinz Eulau, William Bennett Munro Professor of Political Science Emeritus, Stanford University, former president of the American Political Science Association; John H. Bunzel, Senior Research Fellow at the Hoover Institution, former president of San Jose State University and professor of Political Science at Stanford University in the 1950s; Robert C. North, Emeritus Professor of Political Science Stanford University; Robert Walker, Emeritus Professor of Political Science Stanford University.
13. Karl W. Deutsch, former president of the American Political Science Association; Gabriel A. Almond, former president of the American Political Science Association.

14. Herbert McClosky, Professor Emeritus of Political Science, University of California, Berkeley. See, *The Conservative Affirmation*, 171, and *Willmoore Kendall Contra Mundum*, 129-48.
15. Thomas S. Shrook, professor of Political Science University of California Santa Barbara.
16. "Relativism" later reprinted in *Relativism and the Study of Man* (Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1961).
17. Muford Q. Sibley, professor of Political Science at the University of Minnesota. The Stanford "War and the Use of Force" debate between Kendall and Sibley in the Fall of 1959 is legendary. It is however, not well known that Sibley and Kendall had been boyhood friends in Oklahoma.
18. Fredrick Watkins, Department of Political Science, Yale University chairman during this period; Harry V. Jaffa, Henry Salvatori Research Professor of Political Philosophy Emeritus, Claremont McKenna College; Joseph Cropsey, Professor of Political Philosophy Emeritus, University of Chicago.
19. Harvey C. Mansfield, Sr. (1905-1988) professor. Department of Political Science, Ohio State University, editor of the *American Political Science Review*, 1956-1965.
20. Robert A. Dahl, professor of Political Science Yale University, former president of the American Political Science Association.
21. In the introduction to his translation of *Jean-Jacques Rousseau: The Government of Poland*, (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1972) Kendall identifies Count Wielhorski as the one who "commissioned" Rousseau to do *The Government of Poland*. Wielhorski is also identified by Kendall as the person who called on two other political theorists, Mercier de la Riviere and the Abbe Gabriel Bonnot Mably to work on Poland's constitutional problems, x-xi.
22. John H. Hallowell, (1913-1991) Professor of Political Science Emeritus, Duke University.
23. F. H. Bradley (1846-1924); Samuel Alexander (1859-1938); both taught at Oxford.
24. J. W. Gough, *John Locke's Political Philosophy* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1950); George Sabine, *A History of Political Theory* (New York: Holt, 1950).
25. Allan Bloom (1930-1992).
26. Harvey C. Mansfield, Jr., professor of Government, Harvard University.
27. William F. Buckley, Jr.
28. Friedrich A. von Hayek (1889-1992).
29. Leo Strauss and Joseph Cropsey eds., *History of Political Philosophy* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963).
30. Walter W. Heller (1915-1987) served as president of the Council of Economic Advisors in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations.
31. Senator Kenneth B. Keating (1900-1975), (R-NY 1959-1965). On the floor of the Senate, in August and again in October 1962, he alerted the United States to the presence of Soviet missiles in Cuba.
32. This unpublished MS. of Willmoore Kendall is most likely the *Long Farewell to Majority Rule* discussed by George Carey in chapter 2 of this volume.
33. Edward C. Banfield (1916-1999), Professor of Government Emeritus, Harvard University.
34. Leslie Joseph Walker (1877-1955). Christian Edward Detmold (1810-1887). See Leo Strauss, "Walker's Machiavelli" *Review of Metaphysics*, 6 (Winter-Spring 1954), 64-75.

35. Otto von Guericke, *The Development of Political Theory*, trans. Bernard Freyd (New York: W. W. Norton, 1939).
36. George Buchanan (1506-1582) wrote on separation of power a century before Montesquieu's *Spirit of the Laws*.
37. Shlomo Pines (1908-1990), professor, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, translated *Moses Maimonides Guide of the Perplexed*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963).
38. TOM = *Thoughts on Machiavelli*.
39. William Kurt Wimsatt (1907-1975), professor of English, Yale University.
40. Allan Gilbert, Trans., *Machiavelli: The Chief Works and Others*, (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1965.)
41. Robert A. Goldwin, resident scholar, American Enterprise Institute.
42. Roger D. Masters, ed, *The First And Second Discourses* (New York: St. Martins Press, 1964). Professor of Political Science Emeritus, Dartmouth College.
43. Richard H. Cox, *Locke on War and Peace* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960). Professor of Political Science Emeritus, State University of New York, Buffalo.